

Ronald R. Lethin
Ernest P. Lewis, Jr.
Arthur J. Liedel
Harold A. Lipska
Candido H. Lucero
Charles F. Lundy
Peter J. Lynch
Peter H. Lyons
Joseph D. Mankawich
Richard S. Manley
David S. Manuel
Harry A. Marmion
Bruce A. Martin
James V. Martin, Jr.
Robert S. Martin
Robert S. Masters
Gerald S. Mayer
William F. McCaffrey
James G. McClave
Vincent J. McGarry, Jr.
William F. McGinn
Daniel V. McLaughlin
Walter C. McLaughlin
Jimmie L. McWhirt, Sr.
Gilbert D. Meeker
John R. Merrill
William F. Messerli
Bardell D. Miller
Francis X. Moakley
Alwin L. Moeller, Jr.
Albert J. Molesphini
Robert A. Monfort
Hubert G. Much
Domenick Muffi
John A. Mulcahy
John R. Mullin
Timothy C. Murphy
Frank G. Nelson

Margaret L. Nelson
William O. Nelson, Jr.
Robert E. Neumann
Clync Newsome, Jr.
William L. Nicolls
Robert D. Nolan
Kenneth W.
Northwick
Kermeth W.
Northwick
Joseph G. Norton
Donald F. Oatis
Thomas J. O'Donnell, Jr.
Philip F. Oestricher
Thomas W. Ohanlon
Salvatore L. Olivieri
Frank P. Orlando
Paul J. Otis
Paul J. Pardy
Joseph M. Parker, Jr.
Kenton L. Pate
Arthur S. Patron
James D. Pauly
Ronald E. Peduzzi
Stephen Percy
Leland E. Person
James W. Persons
Michael J. Phelan
William Piper
Leonard E. Porter
John R. Powers
Paul E. Pruett
Luigi Ragosta
Robert W. Rauch
Thomas P. Redden, Jr.
Ronald C. Reed
George P. Reilly
Thomas M. Reis
Stephen L. Reveal

Steve E. Richardson
James F. Riley, Jr.
Harold W. Robbins
Frederick C. Robinson, II
Edward H. Roemer
John P. Roos
John K. Roschlaue
Merle R. Rose
William W. Rose, Jr.
Russell A. Rourke
Robert F. Ruan, II
Frederick H. Russell
William H. Sackett
Ronald W. Salmon
Gordon A. Samuel
David W. Santee
William D. Saylor
William E.
Scarborough
James H. Schell
Robert D. Scherer
John F. Schmitt
William L. Seay
Richard T. Secrest
David L. Shane
David F. Sheehan
Robert H.
Shortsleeve
Charles A. Skelton
John D. Slack
Earl F. Sprong
Clarence L. Smith
Elbert G. Smith
Raymond L. Smith

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel:
Harlan P. Chapman
Richard W. Hawthorne
Luther A. Lono
Jerry W. Marvel
James W. McGarvey
Albert Pitt

John P. Stayton
George B. Stebbins, Jr.
Carmon L. Stewart
Robert A. Stiglitz
Leonard B. Stolba
Rodney L. Stone
George E. Strickland
Ray U. Tanner
Paul E. Thomsen
Romaine D. Thorfinnson
James R. Tickle
Tommy A. Tinker
Frank T. Tobin
Howard Troxell
Fred Tschopp, Jr.
Paul D. Tucker
Gerald H. Turley
Foster G. Ulrich, Jr.
Emil L. Veer
Carl R. Venditto
Jerry T. Verkler
Richard D. Wagner
Robert T. Waters
Ben F. Weaver
Larry M. Wheeler
Robert E. Wheeler
John R. Whelan
Robert J. Wiedemann
Alexander P. White, Jr.
James R. White
David Workman
Joel A. Yarboro
William E. Yeager

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
The following-named officer under the provisions of title 50, United States Code, section 403, for appointment as Deputy Director, Central Intelligence Agency, a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Vernon Anthony Walters, xxx-xxx-xxx, U.S. Army.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 2, 1972:

PATENT OFFICE

Robert Gottschalk, of New Jersey, to be Commissioner of Patents.

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

Louis C. Bechtel, of Pennsylvania, to be a U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

James L. Foreman, of Illinois, to be a U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Illinois.

Howard David Hermansdorfer, of Kentucky, to be a U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Kentucky.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

William K. Schaphorst, of Nebraska, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Nebraska for the term of 4 years.

John A. Field III, of West Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of West Virginia for the term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, March 2, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth His handiwork.—Psalm 19:1.

Almighty and eternal God, immortal and invisible, our yearning hearts turn to Thee but in our feeble faith we fail to find Thee. The heavens declare Thy glory and yet so often we do not see it. The earth showeth Thy handiwork, yet so seldom do we realize it. The universe is filled with the sound of music calling us to live life to the full, yet we will not listen. But once in a while in the quiet of the morning, or the calm of a noontime moment, or in the silence of the evening, Thy still, small voice breaks through and we know Thou art with us. As we respond there comes to us anew the peace of the presence and the strength of Thy spirit.

May this be our experience today as we set out to do our work for the good of our country and the peace of our world.

In the spirit of Him who always listened to Thee, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1682. An act to provide for deferment of construction charges payable by Westlands Water District attributable to lands of the Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif., included in said district, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House with an amendment to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 659. An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the General Education Provisions Act (creating a National Foundation for Postsecondary Education and a National Institute of Education), the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Public Law 874, 81st Congress, and related acts, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 748)

entitled "An act to authorize payment and appropriation of the second and third installments of the United States contributions to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 749) entitled "An act to authorize United States contributions to the Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2010) entitled "An act to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3244. An act to amend the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1970, to authorize additional funds for the conduct of an international aeronautical exposition;

S. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of hearings on the "Environmental Protection Act of 1971"; and

S. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Document Numbered 56, entitled "State Utility Commissions—Summary and Tabulation of Information Submitted by the Commissions."

PROVIDING ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR SERVICES PERFORMED BY EMPLOYEES IN HOUSE PUBLICATION DISTRIBUTION SERVICES

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 835 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 835

Resolved, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, there is authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives such sums as may be necessary to pay compensation to each employee of the Publications Distribution Service of the House of Representatives for all services performed by such employee in excess of the normal workday where such services are authorized by the Committee on House Administration. Such compensation shall be paid on an hourly basis at a rate equal to the rate of compensation otherwise paid to such employees.

This resolution shall take effect on its adoption and payments made under this resolution shall be terminated as the Committee on House Administration determines necessary.

Mr. HAYS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPRESENTATIVES UDALL AND PREYER OF NORTH CAROLINA INTRODUCE NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES ACT

(Mr. PREYER of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today Congressman UDALL, of Arizona, and I have introduced the National Educational Opportunities Act. The purpose of this bill is to establish a legislative school policy as an alternative to a court-ordered policy.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has the responsibility to speak now on what our national educational policy should be before it is too late, before that policy is set by the court alone without any guidance from the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is not enough to say, "No busing." We must say, "Here is a better way to accomplish our goals, a better alternative than busing."

Mr. Speaker, the principal draftsman of this bill is Alexander Bickel, professor of constitutional law and legal history at Yale University, and a recognized authority in this field.

I hope Congress will take this bill and use it as a base for developing legislation that can provide the better answers

that we need in this country on education.

Mr. Speaker, I invite the support of all the Members of the House in support of this legislation.

I will include a further explanation and a copy of the bill at a later point in the RECORD today.

AIR-TO-AIR MESSAGE TO THE PENTAGON

(Mr. MOORHEAD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed that the United States has now agreed to supply Venezuela with 100 air-to-air Sidewinder missiles costing a classified amount. I think we have reached the point of complete idiocy. Venezuela needs air-to-air missiles as much as you and I need the bubonic plague. I wonder what imaginary enemy these Sidewinder missiles will sidewind against.

I think we all ought to write President Nixon a letter asking him to conduct a few sanity tests on those administration bureaucrats responsible for this magnificent plan to escalate the arms race in South America.

If any American citizen who supports foreign aid as I do wonders why many Members of Congress vote against it, this is one of the reasons.

I know I cannot justify this Sidewinder caper which is escalating the arms race in Latin America to my constituents so I think the Pentagon decisionmakers should come out to Pittsburgh and try to do it. I can assure you they would be booed off the platform.

A VIETNAM CEASE-FIRE IN RETURN FOR WITHDRAWING TROOPS FROM TAIWAN?

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, like other Members of this House, and the Senate, I have been disturbed by the communique out of Peking as it suggests that perhaps there has been some diminution in our defense commitment to Taiwan.

I have listened these past 2 days to Members of the House who were briefed on these meetings at the White House. They point out that our commitment to withdraw our forces from Taiwan was "when the tension diminishes," and that we have the say over just when that shall be. So, they say, we have not really given away too much in our statements about Taiwan.

Of course, the current "tension" in the Pacific area is the war in Vietnam. Personally I am inclined to believe—and I have already seen some reports of this—that there was some sort of secret understanding in Peking that we would actually withdraw all our forces from Taiwan only when the Chinese had succeeded in getting the North Viet-

namese to agree to a cease-fire in Vietnam, and to come to the conference table for meaningful negotiations. I hope that such a secret agreement with Peking exists. If so, then we have made a good arrangement.

If not, I would urge the President to make it clear to the Chinese that we will not begin any withdrawal until they do something to bring the Vietnam war to an honorable conclusion.

I shall discuss these comments in greater detail in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, later today.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

(Mr. DANIELSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the floor on Wednesday and Thursday, February 23 and 24, 1972, pursuant to leave of absence of the House, due to official business for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

During my absence three record votes were taken. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No. 49—I would have voted "aye" on an amendment to H.R. 12931, the Rural Development Act of 1972, that sought to prevent private organizations or profitmaking corporations which were being punished for creating pollution from receiving Federal subsidies for pollution abatement. This amendment was rejected by a record teller vote of 151 ayes to 224 noes;

Rollcall No. 51—I would have voted "yea" on the conference report on H.R. 12067, making appropriations for foreign aid for fiscal year 1972. The conference report was agreed to by a record vote of 213 yeas and 167 nays.

Rollcall No. 52—I would have voted "nay" on the motion that the House recede and concur with amendment to Senate amendment 27 regarding assistance to Ecuador. The motion was agreed to by a record vote of 230 yeas to 138 nays.

ECONOMIC INDICATORS SHOW THE EXPANSION WILL CONTINUE

(Mr. RHODES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant signposts for evaluating economic outlook is to look at the index of leading economic indicators. Leading economic indicators are measures of various economic activities which have over the years shown a marked relationship to subsequent business conditions. They provide significant clues to the general direction of the economy over the near future.

The Commerce Department recently published the composite index of eight leading economic indicators for January. This index, which includes measures of employment, capital investment and prices, soared 2.3 percent over the previous month, the largest single monthly

gain since October 1968. The rise in January was the fifth consecutive monthly increase in this index. Moreover, the trend in these indicators since last spring has been unmistakably strong. This experience foreshadows sound economic gains for the future.

The leading indicators series is not an infallible guide to future economic developments. However, when combined with other favorable evidence, such as anticipated business investment and new housing starts, it makes a strong case for economic expansion over the coming months.

Were there only one or two economic indicators rising, there would be little cause for optimism. But the number of indicators currently advancing demonstrate that the economy is embarked on a strong sustainable upward advance.

REVENUE SHARING

(Mr. PEYSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon on the floor of the House I filed with great reluctance a discharge petition. I filed this petition because we, in the House, have been discussing for the past 13 or 14 months the tremendous problems that have been faced by our cities and States in this country.

One of the pressing needs we have all recognized and spoken of is the need for financial aid to those areas and financial aid now. We have had repeated assurances that this aid would be forthcoming in the form of a revenue-sharing bill from the Committee on Ways and Means. I have great confidence in the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) in drawing up an excellent bill on revenue sharing.

It is for this reason that I have introduced the discharge petition calling for Chairman MILLS' own bill on revenue sharing so that the House will have a chance to act its will.

BUSING DISCHARGE PETITION

(Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at the expiration of that time I will have a unanimous-consent request concerning an amendment to the rules of the House.

POINT OF ORDER OF NO QUORUM

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman wish to make the point of order at this time or wait until after the 1-minute speeches are concluded?

Mr. WYDLER. I wish to make the point of order now, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The Chair will count.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. THOMPSON) is recognized.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a cry from the public for freedom of information about legislative dealings. The cry extends all the way from committee meetings being open to the public to allowing radio and proceedings.

One of the demands I am experiencing from the public I represent is a demand to know who have introduced what bills concerning antibusing measures in the public schools. This, of course, is readily available information.

There is also a demand from the public, Mr. Speaker, to know the names of those Congressmen who signed a discharge petition on antibusing constitutional amendments. But this is prohibited information.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this time that the rules of the House be amended and that the Clerk be instructed to make available to the members of the press the names of the persons who have signed the petition.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not going to recognize the gentleman for that purpose. Therefore, there is no reason for objecting to it.

Speaker Garner ruled a long time ago and subsequent Speakers have followed the practice on this ruling which is to be found in volume VII of Cannon's Precedents, section 1008, and which is as follows:

Signatures to a motion to discharge committees are not made public until the requisite number have signed and the motion appears in the Journal and Record.

Therefore, the Chair will not recognize the gentleman for the purpose for which he made his unanimous-consent request.

AIRPORT NOISE: THE DIVERSION OF JET TRAFFIC FROM FRIENDSHIP TO NATIONAL AS A RESULT OF FAA'S "MISMANAGEMENT" OF THE MATTER

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the recent House debate over amendments to the Noise Control Act of 1972 brought to the fore several serious questions relative to the management of Washington National Airport and Dulles International by the Federal Aviation Administration. At that time, I pointed out that although the FAA had imposed a curfew on jet traffic at National, it permitted violations of its own curfew. So distressed are many area residents, Virginians and Marylanders, that they have brought suit to ban all jet traffic at National after 11. A U.S. district judge recently denied motions to dismiss the suit, affirmed the citizens' right to defend their own health and safety, and set a trial date of May 8, 1972.

Because of this mismanagement, I have sponsored legislation to provide for a eventual regional takeover with local control of the three area airports in an effort to work out a distribution of traffic among the area airports to the benefit of all area residents. Senator Spong is a sponsor and is pushing for passage in the Senate.

Gentlemen, it is apparent from recent passenger figures that the FAA is determined to shoehorn as many passengers as possible into National Airport. In 1971, Friendship Airport, Maryland's excellent jet facility, experienced a loss of well over 200,000 passengers from their 1970 traffic, and concern has been voiced that further decreases may well be in the offing. Dulles International lost 20,000 passengers. Shockingly, National Airport, already overflowing with humanity and jet traffic, increased its passenger handle by 500,000. These figures reflect a net increase in area passengers of 280,000.

This upsetting loss of Friendship and Dulles airports can be directly related to the continual use of the 727-200 stretch jets at National.

And the use of these stretch jets at National is the direct responsibility of FAA. The clear intent of the FAA agency is to continue to expand Washington National Airport at the expense of the other area facilities, as well as at the expense of area residents.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York withhold his point of order?

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

TOWARD A BETTER HEALTH CARE SYSTEM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-261)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

The message referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union:

To the Congress of the United States:

An all-directions reform of our health care system—so that every citizen will be able to get quality health care at reasonable cost regardless of income and regardless of area of residence—remains an item of highest priority on my unfinished agenda for America in the 1970s.

In the ultimate sense, the general good health of our people is the foundation of our national strength, as well as being the truest wealth that individuals can possess.

Nothing should impede us from doing whatever is necessary to bring the best possible health care to those who do not now have it—while improving health

care quality for everyone—at the earliest possible time.

In 1971, I submitted to the Congress my new National Health Strategy which would produce the kind of health care Americans desire and deserve, at costs we all can afford.

Since that time, a great national debate over health care has taken place. And both branches of the Congress have conducted searching examinations of our health needs, receiving and studying testimony from all segments of our society.

The Congress has acted on measures advancing certain parts of my National Health Strategy:

- The Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971 and the Nurse Training Act of 1971, which I signed last November, will spur the greatest effort in our history to expand the supply of health personnel. Additionally and importantly, it will attract them to the areas of health care shortages, helping to close one of the most glaring gaps in our present system.
- The Congress also passed the National Cancer Act which I proposed last year. This action opens the way for a high-intensity effort to defeat the No. 2 killer and disabler of our time, an effort fueled by an additional \$100 million in the last year. A total of \$430 million is budgeted for cancer programs in fiscal year 1973, compared to \$185 million in fiscal year 1969.
- The Congress responded to my statement of early 1970 on needed improvements in veterans medical care by authorizing increased funds in 1971 and 1972, increases which have brought the VA hospital-to-patient ratios to an all-time high and have provided many additional specialty and medical services, including increased medical manpower training.
- The Congress also created a National Health Service Corps of young professionals to serve the many rural areas and inner city neighborhoods which are critically short on health care. By mid-summer, more than 100 communities around the Nation will be benefiting from these teams.

These are important steps, without doubt, but we still must lay the bedrock foundations for a new national health care system for all our people.

The need for action is critical for far too many of our citizens.

The time for action is now.

I therefore again urge the Congress to act on the many parts of my health care program which are still pending so that we can end—at the earliest possible time—the individual anguishes, the needless neglects and the family financial fears caused by the gaps, inequities and maldistributions of the present system.

The United States now spends more than \$75 billion annually on health care—and for most people, relatively good service results.

Yet, despite this huge annual national outlay, millions of citizens do not have adequate access to health care. Our rec-

ord in this field does not live up to our national potential.

That sobering fact should summon us to prompt but effective action to reform and reorganize health care practices, while simultaneously resisting the relentless inflation of health care costs.

MORE THAN MONEY IS NEEDED

When the subject of health care improvements is mentioned, as is the case with so many other problems, too many people and too many institutions think first and solely of money—bills, payments, premiums, coverages, grants, subsidies and appropriations.

But far more than money is involved in our current health care crisis.

More money is important—but any attempted health care solution based primarily on money is simply not going to do the job.

In health care as in so many other areas, the most expensive remedy is not necessarily the most effective one.

One basic shortcoming of a solution to health care problems which depends entirely on spending more money, can be seen in the Medicare and Medicaid programs. Medicare and Medicaid did deliver needed dollars to the health care problems of the elderly and the poor. But at the same time, little was done to alter the existing supply and distribution of doctors, nurses, hospitals and other health resources. Our health care supply, in short, remained largely the same while massive new demands were loaded onto it.

The predictable result was an acute price inflation, one basic cause of our health economic quandary of the past 11 years.

In this period, national health expenditures rose by 188 percent, from \$26 billion in fiscal 1960 to \$75 billion in fiscal 1971. But a large part of this enormous increase in the Nation's health expenditure went, not for more and better health care, but merely to meet price inflation.

If we do not lessen this trend, all other reform efforts may be in vain.

That is why my National Health Strategy was designed with built-in incentives to encourage sensible economies—in the use of health facilities, in direct cost-control procedures, and through more efficient ways to bring health care to people at the community level. That is also why we have given careful attention to medical prices in Phase II of the Economic Stabilization Program.

Several months ago, the Price Commission ruled that increases in physician fees must be kept to within 2½ percent. Rules also were issued to hold down runaway price increases among hospitals, nursing homes and other health care institutions. All of these efforts were directed toward our goal of reducing the previous 7.7 percent annual price increase in total health care costs to half of that level, 3.85 percent this year.

These actions should buy us some time. But they are, at best, a temporary tourniquet on health care price inflation.

We must now direct our energies, attentions and action to the long-range factors affecting the cost, the quality and the availability of medical care.

My overall program, of course, is one

that would improve health care for everyone. But it is worthy of special note that these recommendations have a particular importance and a high value for older Americans, whose health care needs usually rise just as their incomes are declining.

WE SHOULD BUILD ON PRESENT STRENGTHS

When we examine the status of health care in America, we always must be careful to recognize its strengths. For most Americans, more care of higher quality has been the result of our rising national investment in health, both governmental and private.

We lead the world in medical science, research and development. We have obliterated some major diseases and drastically reduced the incidence of others. New institutions, new treatments and new drugs abound. There has been a marked and steady gain in the number of people covered by some form of health insurance to 84 percent of those under 65, and coverages have been expanding. Life expectancy has risen by 3.4 percent since 1950 and the maternal death rate has declined 66 percent. Days lost from work in the same period are down 3.5 percent and days lost from school have declined 7.5 percent—both excellent measures of the general good state of our health.

All of this is progress—real progress.

It would be folly to raze the structure that produced this progress—and start from scratch on some entirely new basis—in order to repair shortcomings and redirect and revitalize the thrust of our health system.

To nationalize health care as some have proposed, and thus federalize medical personnel, institutions and procedures—eventually if not at the start—also would amount to a stunning new financial burden for every American taxpayer.

The average household would pay more than \$1,000 a year as its share of the required new Federal expenditure of more than \$80 billion each and every year. Such a massive new Federal budget item would run counter to the temper of the American taxpayer.

Also, such a massive new Federal budget item would run counter to the efforts of this Administration to decentralize programs and revenues, rather than bring new responsibilities to Washington.

And, finally, such a massive new Federal budget requirement would dim our efforts to bring needed Federal actions in many new areas—some of which bear directly on health, such as environmental protection.

Clearly we must find a better answer to the deficiencies in our health care system. Unfortunately, such deficiencies are not difficult to identify:

—In inner cities and in many rural areas, there is an acute shortage of physicians. Health screening under various government programs has found that appalling percentages of young people, mostly from deprived areas, have not seen a doctor since early childhood, have never seen a dentist and have never received any preventive care.

- General practitioners are scarce in many areas and many people, regardless of income or location, have difficulty obtaining needed medical attention on short notice.
- Our medical schools must turn away qualified applicants.
- While we emphasize preventive maintenance for our automobiles and appliances, we do not do the same for our bodies. The private health insurance system, good as it is, operates largely as standby emergency equipment, not coming into use until we are stricken and admitted to the most expensive facility, a hospital.
- Relative affluence is no ultimate protection against health care costs. A single catastrophic illness can wipe out the financial security of almost any family under most present health insurance policies.

To remedy these problems, however, will require far more than the efforts of the Federal Government—although the Federal role is vital and will be met by this Administration.

It is going to take the complementing efforts of many other units, of government at the State and local levels; of educational and health organizations and institutions of all kinds; of physicians and other medical personnel of all varieties; of private enterprise and of individual citizens.

My National Health Strategy is designed to enlist all those creative talents into a truly national effort, coordinated but not regimented by four guiding principles:

Capitalizing on existing strengths: We resolve to preserve the best in our existing health care system, building upon those strong elements the new programs needed to correct existing deficiencies.

Equal access for all to health care: We must do all we can to end any racial, economic, social or geographical barriers which may prevent any citizen from obtaining adequate health protection.

Balanced supply and demand: It makes little sense to expand the demand for health care without also making certain that proper increases take place in the numbers of available physicians and other medical personnel, in hospitals and in other kinds of medical facilities.

Efficient organization: We must bring basic reorganizations to our health care system so that we can cease reinforcing inequities and relying on inefficiencies. The exact same system which has failed us in many cases in the past certainly will not be able to serve properly the increased demands of the future.

MAJOR ACTIONS AWAITED

Three major programs, now awaiting action in the Congress after substantial hearings and study, would give life to these principles.

- The National Health Insurance Partnership Act,
- The Health Maintenance Organization Assistance Act,
- and H.R. 1, my welfare reform bill which also would amend Medicare and Medicaid in several significant ways.

THE NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE PARTNERSHIP ACT

This proposal for a comprehensive national health insurance program, in which the public and private sector would join, would guarantee that no American family would have to forego needed medical attention because of inability to pay. My plan would fill gaps in our present health insurance coverage. But, beyond that, it would redirect our entire system to better and more efficient ways of bringing health care to our people.

There are two critical parts of this Act:

1. *The National Health Insurance Standards Act* would require employers to provide adequate health insurance for their employees, who would share in underwriting its costs. This approach follows precedents of long-standing under which personal security—and thus national economic progress—has been enhanced by requiring employers to provide minimum wages and disability and retirement benefits and to observe occupational health and safety standards.

Required coverages would include not less than \$50,000 protection against catastrophic costs for each family member; hospital services; physician services both in and out of a hospital; maternity care; well-baby care (including immunizations); laboratory expenses and certain other costs.

The proposed package would include certain deductibles and coinsurance features, which would help keep costs down by encouraging the use of more efficient health care procedures.

It would permit many workers, as an alternative to paying separate fees for services, to purchase instead memberships in a Health Maintenance Organization. The fact that workers and unions would have a direct economic stake in the program would serve as an additional built-in incentive for avoiding unnecessary costs and yet maintaining high quality.

The national standards prescribed, moreover, would necessarily limit the range within which benefits could vary. This provision would serve to sharpen competition and cost-consciousness among insurance companies seeking to provide coverage at the lowest overall cost.

Any time the Federal Government, in effect, prescribes and guarantees certain things it must take the necessary follow-through steps to assure that the interests of consumers and taxpayers are fully protected.

Accordingly, legislative proposals have been submitted to the Congress within recent weeks for regulating private health insurance companies, in order to assure that they can and will do the job, and that insurance will be offered at reasonable rates. In addition, States would be required to provide group-rate coverage for people such as the self-employed and special groups who do not qualify for other plans.

2. Another vital step in my proposed program is the *Family Health Insurance Plan (FHIP)* which would meet the needs

of poor families not covered by the National Health Insurance Standards Act because they are headed by unemployed or self-employed persons whose income is below certain levels. For a family of four, the ceiling for eligibility would be an annual income of \$5,000. FHIP would replace that portion of Medicaid designed to help such families. Medicaid would remain for the aged poor, the blind, the disabled and some children.

HEALTH MAINTENANCE ORGANIZATIONS

Beyond filling gaps in insurance coverage, we must also turn our attention to how the money thus provided will be spent—on what kind of services and in what kind of institutions. This is why the Health Maintenance Organization concept is such a central feature of my National Health Strategy.

The HMO is a method for financing and providing health care that has won growing respect. It brings together into a single organization the physician, the hospital, the laboratory and the clinic, so that patients can get the right care at the right moment.

HMO's utilize a method of payment that encourages the prevention of illness and promotes the efficient use of doctors and hospitals. Unlike traditional fee-for-service billing, the HMO contracts to provide its comprehensive care for a fixed annual sum that is determined in advance.

Under this financial arrangement, the doctors' and hospitals' incomes are determined not by how much the patient is sick, but by how much he is well. HMO's thus have the strongest possible incentive for keeping well members from becoming ill and for curing sick members as quickly as possible.

I do not believe that HMO's should or will entirely replace fee-for-service financing. But I do believe that they ought to be everywhere available so that families will have a choice between these methods. The HMO is no mere drawing-board concept—more than 7 million Americans are now HMO subscribers and that number is growing.

Several pieces of major legislation now before the Congress would give powerful stimulus to the development of HMO's:

1. *The Health Maintenance Organization Assistance Act* would provide technical and financial aid to help new HMO's get started, and would spell out standards of operation;

2. *The National Health Insurance Partnership Act* described above requires that individuals be given a choice between fee-for-service or HMO payment plans;

3. H.R. 1 contains one provision allowing HMO-type reimbursement for Medicare patients and another that would increase the Federal share of payments made to HMO's under State Medicaid programs.

I urge that the Congress give early consideration to these three measures, in order to hasten the development of this efficient method for low-cost, one-stop health service. Meantime, the administration has moved forward in this area on its own under existing legislative authorities.

Last year, while HMO legislation was being prepared, I directed the Depart-

ment of Health, Education, and Welfare to focus existing funds and staff on an early HMO development effort. This effort has already achieved payoffs:

To date, 110 planning and development grants and contracts have been let to potential HMO sponsors and some 200,000 medicaid patients are now enrolled in HMO-type plans. Also, in a few months, 10 Family Health Centers will be operating with federally-supported funds to provide prepaid health care to persons living in underserved areas. Each of these Centers can develop into a full-service HMO. I have requested funds in 1973 to expand this support.

To keep this momentum going, I have included in the fiscal year 1972 supplemental budget \$27 million for HMO development, and requested \$60 million for this purpose in fiscal year 1973.

I will also propose amendments to the pending HMO Assistance Act that would authorize the establishment of an HMO loan fund.

THE NATIONAL NEED FOR H.R. 1

One of the greatest hazards to life and health is poverty. Death and illness rates among the poor are many times those for the rest of the Nation. The steady elimination of poverty would in itself improve the health of millions of Americans.

H.R. 1's main purpose is to help people lift themselves free of poverty's grip by providing them with jobs, job training, income supplements for the working poor and child care centers for mothers seeking work.

For this reason alone, enactment of H.R. 1 must be considered centerpiece legislation in the building of a National Health Strategy.

But H.R. 1 also includes the following measures to extend health care to more Americans—especially older Americans—and to control costs:

Additional Persons Covered:

- Persons eligible for Part A of Medicare (hospital care) would be automatically enrolled in Part B (physician's care).
- Medicare (both Parts A and B) would be extended to many disabled persons not now covered.

H.R. 1 as it now stands, however, would still require monthly premium payments to cover the costs of Part B. I have recommended that the Congress eliminate this \$5.80 monthly premium payment and finance Medicare coverage of physician services through the social security payroll tax. This can be done within the Medicare tax rate now included in H.R. 1. If enacted, this change would save \$1.5 billion annually for older Americans and would be equivalent to a 5 percent increase in social security cash benefits.

Cost Control Features:

- Medicare and Medicaid reimbursement would be denied any hospital or other institution for interest, depreciation and service charges on any construction disapproved by local or regional health planning agencies. Moreover, to strengthen local and regional health planning agencies, my fiscal year 1973 budget would increase the Federal matching share. In addition, grants to establish 100

new local and 20 new State planning agencies would bring health planning to more than 80 percent of the Nation's population.

- Reviews of claim samples and utilization patterns, which have saved much money in the Medicare program, would be applied to Medicaid.
 - The efficiency of Medicaid hospitals and health facilities would be improved by testing various alternative methods of reimbursing them.
 - Cost sharing would be introduced after 30 days of hospitalization under Medicare.
 - Federal Medicaid matching rates would decline one-third after the first 60 days of care.
 - Federal Medicaid matching rates would be increased 25 percent for services for which the States contract with HMO's or other comprehensive health care facilities.
- These latter three revisions are aimed at minimizing inefficient institutional care and encouraging more effective modes of treatment.

RESEARCH AND PREVENTION PROGRAMS

My overall health program encompasses actions on three levels: (1) improving protection against health care costs; (2) improving the health care system itself; and (3) working creatively on research and prevention efforts, to eradicate health menaces and to hold down the incidence of illnesses.

A truly effective national health strategy requires that a significant share of Federal research funds be concentrated on major health threats, particularly when research advances indicate the possibility of breakthrough progress.

Potentially high payoff health research and prevention programs include:

HEART DISEASE

If current rates of incidence continue, some 12 million Americans will suffer heart attacks in the next 10 years.

I shortly will assign a panel of distinguished professional experts to guide us in determining why heart disease is so prevalent and what we should be doing to combat it. In the meantime, the fiscal year 1973 budget provides funds for exploring:

- the development of new medical devices to assist blood circulation and improved instruments for the early detection of heart disease; and
- tests to explore the relationship of such high-risk factors as smoking, high blood pressure and high blood fats to the onset and progression of heart disease.

CANCER

The National Cancer Act I signed into law December 23, 1971, creates the authority for organizing an all-out attack on this dread disease. The new cancer program it creates will be directly responsive to the President's direction.

This new program's work will be given further momentum by my decision last October to convert the former biological warfare facility at Fort Detrick, Maryland into a cancer research center.

To finance this all-out research effort, I have requested that an additional \$93

million be allocated for cancer research in fiscal year 1973, bringing the total funding available that year to \$430 million.

In the past two and one-half years, we have more than doubled the funding for cancer research, reflecting this Administration's strong commitment to defeat this dread killer as soon as humanly possible.

ALCOHOLISM

One tragic and costly illness which touches every community in our land is alcoholism. There are more than 9 million alcoholics and alcohol abusers in our Nation.

The human cost of this condition is incalculable—broken homes, broken lives and the tragedy of 28,000 victims of alcohol-related highway deaths every year.

The recently established National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism will soon launch an intensive public education program through television and radio and will continue to support model treatment projects from which States and communities will be able to pattern programs to fight this enemy.

Meanwhile, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Transportation are funding projects in 35 States to demonstrate the value of highway safety, enforcement and education efforts among drinking drivers. The Veterans Administration will increase the number of its Alcohol Dependence Treatment Units by more than one-third, to 56 units in fiscal year 1973.

DRUG ABUSE

Drug abuse now constitutes a national emergency.

In response to this threat and to the need for coordination of Federal programs aimed at drug abuse, I established the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention within the Executive Office of the President. Its special areas of action are programs for treating and rehabilitating the drug abuser and for alerting our young people to the dangers of drug abuse.

I have proposed legislation to the Congress which would extend and clarify the authority of this Office. I am hopeful that Senate and House conferees will soon be able to resolve differences in the versions passed by the two branches and emerge with a single bill responsive to the Nation's needs.

The new Special Action Office, however, has not been idly awaiting this legislation. It has been vigorously setting about the task of identifying the areas of greatest need and channelling Federal resources into these areas.

The Department of Defense, for example, working in close coordination with the Special Action Office, has instituted drug abuse identification, education, and treatment programs which effectively combated last year's heroin problem among our troops in South Vietnam. Indications are that the corner has been turned on this threat and that the incidence of drug dependence among our troops is declining.

The Veterans Administration, again in coordination with the Special Action Office, has accomplished more than a

sixfold increase in the number of drug dependency treatment centers in fiscal year 1972, with an increase to 44 centers proposed in fiscal year 1973.

In fiscal year 1972, I have increased funds available for the prevention of drug abuse by more than 130 percent. For fiscal year 1973, I have requested over \$365 million to treat the drug abuser and prevent the spread of the affliction of drug abuse.

This is more than eight times as much as was being spent for this purpose when this Administration took office.

SICKLE CELL DISEASE

About one out of every 500 black infants falls victim to the painful, life-shortening disease called sickle cell anemia. This inherited disease trait is carried by about two million black Americans.

In fiscal year 1972, \$10 million was allocated to attack this problem and an advisory committee of prominent black leaders was organized to help direct the effort. This committee's recommendations are in hand and an aggressive action program is ready to start.

To underwrite this effort, I am proposing to increase the new budget for sickle cell disease from \$10 million in fiscal 1972 to \$15 million in fiscal 1973.

The Veteran's Administration's medical care system also can be counted on to make an important contribution to the fight against sickle cell anemia.

Eight separate research projects concerning sickle cell anemia are underway in VA hospitals and more will be started this year. All 166 VA hospitals will launch a broad screening, treatment and educational effort to combat this disease.

On any given day, about 17,000 black veterans are in VA hospitals and some 116,000 are treated annually.

All these expanded efforts will lead to a better and longer life for thousands of black Americans.

FAMILY PLANNING SERVICES

Nearly 3 years ago, I called for a program that would provide family planning services to all who wanted them but could not afford their cost. The timetable for achieving this goal was 5 years.

To meet that schedule, funding for services administered by the National Center for Family Planning for this program has been steadily increased from \$39 million in fiscal year 1971 to \$91 million in fiscal year 1972. I am requesting \$139 million for this Center in fiscal year 1973.

Total Federal support for family planning services and research in fiscal 1973 will rise to \$240 million, a threefold increase since fiscal year 1969.

VENEREAL DISEASE

Last year, more than 2.5 million venereal disease cases were detected in the United States. Two-thirds of the victims were under 25.

A concentrated program to find persons with infectious cases and treat them is needed to bring this disease under control. I am therefore, recommending that \$31 million be allocated for this purpose in fiscal year 1973, more than two and one-half times the level of support for VD programs in 1971.

HEALTH EDUCATION

Aside from formal treatment programs, public and private, the general health of individuals depends very much on their own informed actions and practices.

Last year, I proposed that a National Health Education Foundation be established to coordinate a nationwide program to alert people on ways in which they could protect their own health. Since that time, a number of public meetings have been held by a committee I established then to gather views on all aspects of health education. The report of this committee will be sent to me this year.

The committee hopes to define more explicitly the Nation's need for health education programs and to determine ways of rallying all the resources of our society to meet this need.

CONSUMER SAFETY

More than a half century has passed since basic legislation was enacted to ensure the safety of the foods and drugs which Americans consume. Since then, industrial and agricultural revolutions have generated an endless variety of new products, food additives, industrial compounds, cosmetics, synthetic fabrics and other materials which are employed to feed, clothe, medicate and adorn the American consumer.

These revolutions created an entirely new man-made environment—and we must make absolutely certain that this new environment does not bring harmful side-effects which outweigh its evident benefits.

The only way to ensure that goal is met is to give the agency charged with that responsibility the resources it needs to meet the challenge.

My budget request for the Food and Drug Administration for fiscal year 1973 represents the largest single-year expansion in the history of this agency—70 percent. I believe this expansion is amply justified by the magnitude of the task this agency faces.

In the past year, the foundations for a modern program of consumer protection have been laid. The FDA has begun a detailed review of the thousands of non-prescription drug products now marketed. The pharmaceutical industry has been asked to cooperate in compiling a complete inventory of every drug available to the consumer.

Meanwhile, I have proposed the following legislation to ensure more effective protection for consumers:

- A wholesome fish and fish products bill which provides for the expansion of inspections of fish handlers and greater authority to assure the safety of fish products.

- A Consumer Product Safety bill which would authorize the Federal Government to establish and enforce new standards for product safety.

- Medical device legislation which would not only authorize the establishment of safety standards for these products, but would also provide for premarketing scientific review when warranted.

- A drug identification bill now before the Congress would provide a

method for quickly and accurately identifying any pill or tablet. This provision would reduce the risk of error in taking medicines and allow prompt treatment following accidental ingestion.

- The Toxic Substances Control Act that I proposed last year also awaits action by the Congress. This legislation would require any company developing a new chemical that may see widespread use to test it thoroughly beforehand for possible toxic effects.

NURSING HOMES

If there is one place to begin upgrading the quality of health care, it is in the nursing homes that care for older Americans. Many homes provide excellent care and concern, but far too many others are callous, understaffed, unsanitary and downright dangerous.

Last August I announced an eight-point program to upgrade the quality of life and the standards of care in American nursing homes. The Federal interest and responsibility in this field is clear, since Federal programs including Medicare and Medicaid provide some 40 percent of total nursing home income nationally.

That HEW effort is well underway now.

Federal field teams have surveyed every State nursing home inspection program, and as a result 38 of 39 States found to have deficiencies have corrected them. The 39th is acting to meet Federal standards. To help States upgrade nursing homes, I have proposed legislation to pay 100 percent of the costs of inspecting these facilities.

Meanwhile, at my direction, a federally funded program to train 2,000 State nursing home inspectors and to train 41,000 nursing home employees is also underway. The Federal field force for assisting nursing homes is being augmented and fire, safety and health codes have been strengthened.

One way to measure the results of these efforts is to learn how patients in nursing homes feel about the care they are given. We have therefore also begun a program to monitor the complaints and suggestions of nursing home residents.

APPLYING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

In my State of the Union message, I proposed a new Federal partnership with the private sector to stimulate civilian technological research and development. One of the most vital areas where we can focus this partnership—perhaps utilizing engineers and scientists displaced from other jobs—is in improving human health. Opportunities in this field include:

1. *Emergency Medical Services:* By using new technologies to improve emergency care systems and by using more and better trained people to run those systems, we can save the lives of many heart attack victims and many victims of auto accidents every year. The loss to the Nation represented by these unnecessary deaths cannot be calculated. I have already allocated \$8 million in fiscal year 1972 to develop model systems and training programs and my budget proposes

that \$15 million be invested for additional demonstrations in fiscal year 1973.

2. *Blood:* Blood is a unique national resource. An adequate system for collecting and delivering blood at its time and place of need can save many lives. Yet we do not have a nationwide system to meet this need and we need to draw upon the skills of modern management and technology to develop one. I have therefore directed the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to make an intensive study and to recommend to me as soon as possible a plan for developing a safe, fast and efficient nationwide blood collection and distribution system.

3. *Health Information Systems:* Each physician, hospital and clinic today is virtually an information island unto itself. Records and billings are not kept on the same basis everywhere, laboratory tests are often needlessly repeated and vital patient data can get lost. All of these problems have been accentuated because our population is so constantly on the move. The technology exists to end this chaos and improve the quality of care. I have therefore asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to plan a series of projects to demonstrate the feasibility of developing integrated and uniform systems of health information.

4. *Handicapping Conditions:* In America today there are half a million blind, 850,000 deaf and 15 million suffering paralysis and loss of limbs. So far, the major responses to their need to gain self-sufficiency have been vocational rehabilitation and welfare programs. Now the skills that took us to the moon and back need to be put to work developing devices to help the blind see, the deaf hear and the crippled move.

TOWARD A BETTER HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

Working together, this Administration and the Congress already have taken some significant strides in our mutual determination to provide the best, and the most widely available, health care system the world has ever known.

The time now has come to take the final steps to reorganize, to revitalize and to redirect American health care—to build on its historic accomplishments, to close its gaps and to provide it with the incentives and sustenance to move toward a more perfect mission of human compassion.

I believe that the health care resources of America in 1972, if strengthened and expanded as I have proposed in this Message, will be more than sufficient to move us significantly toward that great goal.

If the Administration and the Congress continue to act together—and act on the major proposals this year, as I strongly again urge—then the 1970's will be remembered as an era in which the United States took the historic step of making the health of the entire population not only a great goal but a practical objective.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 2, 1972.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON HEALTH CARE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the House should care-

fully read the message on health care sent to us by the President. It is a most comprehensive message, spelling out what the executive branch and the Congress have done to deal with our health-care problems and detailing what remains to be done.

I agree with the President that solving our health-care problems is one of the most challenging tasks facing the Congress and the American people.

I further agree with the President that we should build on our present health-care delivery system, not tear down what we have and start from scratch simply because we are plagued by some deficiencies. My party's position is sound. We should meet our health-care problems by improving the present system, not by scrapping it and erecting a horrendously costly Federal bureaucratic structure in its place.

The President's message lists the major actions we should take to improve our health-care delivery system and also emphasizes the need for enactment of H.R. 1 as the centerpiece of the revamped program. The President has afforded us a detailed explanation of how the medicare and medicaid provisions in H.R. 1 would benefit older Americans and help to control escalating health-care costs.

The President's message is also important for its emphasis on programs related to the central problem of health-care delivery. I wish to commend him for the progress he has made on these various programs and I further wish to urge congressional action to implement these programs where recommended by the President.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress would do well to treat the President's message with the urgency it deserves and to make good use of the short time remaining in this session for action on health-care needs.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 59]

| | | |
|-----------------|------------|----------------|
| Abourezk | Goldwater | O'Neill |
| Anderson, | Grasso | Pelly |
| Tenn. | Gray | Pike |
| Andrews | Hébert | Poage |
| Annunzio | Heinz | Powell |
| Ashbrook | Hogan | Pryor, Ark. |
| Baring | Hunt | Pucinski |
| Bell | Karth | Purcell |
| Blatnik | Kluczynski | Riegle |
| Camp | Kyros | Rosenthal |
| Celler | Landrum | Rostenkowski |
| Chisholm | Latta | Saylor |
| Clark | Leggett | Scheuer |
| Clay | Long, La. | Shipley |
| Collins, Ill. | Long, Md. | Shoup |
| Davis, Wis. | McCloskey | Steed |
| Dellums | McCulloch | Stubblefield |
| Dwyer | McMillan | Teague, Calif. |
| Eckhardt | Macdonald, | Teague, Tex. |
| Edwards, Calif. | Mass. | Tiernan |
| Edwards, La. | Martin | Vanik |
| Esch | Metcalfe | Wilson, Bob |
| Frey | Mitchell | Wilson, |
| Galliganakis | Morgan | Charles H. |
| Gallagher | Nichols | |

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 360 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REQUEST TO APPOINT CONFEREES ON S. 659, EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1972

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 659) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the General Education Provisions Act—creating a National Foundation for Post-secondary Education and a National Institute of Education—the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Public Law 874, 81st Congress, and related acts, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

HIGH-SPEED GROUND TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 850 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 850

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11384) to extend the Act of September 30, 1965, relating to high-speed ground transportation, by enlarging the authority of the Secretary to undertake research and development, removing the termination date thereof, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, and all points of order against said substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 7, rule XVI and clause 4, rule XI are hereby waived. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. After the passage of H.R. 11384, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 979, and it shall then

be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 11384 as passed by the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Hawaii is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most amazing things about man is that he never ceases to learn. When he ceases to learn, of course, he ceases to grow, and when he ceases to grow, it is time for him to go.

I am not sure whether there is any lesson to be gained from what one of my good friends from Taiwan told me only 2 days ago, but this is what he had to say: That Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai proved once again that the Chinese are the shrewdest traders in the world—for two black and white pandas they acquired two musk oxen and Taiwan to boot.

Mr. HALL. Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is the gentleman speaking out of order?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HALL. Has the gentleman made a unanimous-consent request to speak out of order?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Those are just introductory remarks, I will tell the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. They are exceedingly strange, I will say to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. If the gentleman from Missouri will permit me, he will see the connection.

One thing we Americans have indeed learned is that our mass ground transportation certainly can stand improvement.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 850 provides for consideration of H.R. 11384, which bill, as reported by our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, would extend the High-Speed Ground Transportation Act of 1965 for 3 more years, expand the scope of that act in certain particulars, and authorize appropriations totaling \$315.2 million for the 3-year period. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate, after which the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The resolution further provides that it shall be in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and points of order are waived against the substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 7 of rule XVI, and clause 4 of rule XXI. The waiver is necessary because the committee amendment, in the form of a substitute, contains provisions which are not germane to the subject matter of the original legislation, and funds provided under existing law which remain available until expended, are made available for door-to-door transportation under this new bill. House Resolution 850 also provides that after consideration of H.R. 11384, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be discharged from further consideration of

S. 979, and it shall be in order to move to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and amend it with the House-passed language.

Mr. Speaker, in enacting the High-Speed Ground Transportation Act in 1965, Congress recognized the urgent need to improve the Nation's surface transportation systems, particularly our rail transportation network, and generally to make them safe, adequate, economical and efficient. An intensive program of research and development under the 1965 act resulted in several major accomplishments, among which is one that is very familiar to all of us. The Metroliner demonstration which has shown that there is a very real demand for improved rail passenger service.

H.R. 11384 is designed to sustain and broaden the impetus which has been provided by the 1965 law. The Secretary of Transportation would be authorized not only to undertake research and development in rail transportation systems, but also to research into door-to-door transportation systems and their coordination with other modes of high-speed ground transportation. Hopefully, success in this area will contribute greatly toward reducing air pollution by lessening the number of polluting commuter automobiles on our cities' streets and highways.

Mr. Speaker, an added desirable feature of H.R. 11384 is that the Secretary of Transportation would be required to consider areas of high unemployment in entering into contracts under the program.

The bill would also authorize appropriations in the amount of \$97 million for fiscal year 1973, \$126 million for fiscal year 1974, and \$92.2 million for fiscal year 1975.

Mr. Speaker, I had the delightful experience almost 7 years ago of traveling from Tokyo to Kyoto in Japan, on the world-famous Tokaido train. It was as if I were traveling aboard a jetplane, zooming along the countryside at 125 miles per hour, with no sideway sway, no backward jerk, no clacking of the tracks.

It occurred to me at that moment, Mr. Speaker, that with all of the resources we Americans have we ought to be able to do better. The adoption of this resolution and the passage of the bill H.R. 11384, today will be a strong indication that we are indeed determined to do better.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, the rule, House Resolution 850, provides for a 1-hour open rule and makes it in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. In addition, the rule includes two waivers of points of order. First, the rule waives all points of order against the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 7, rule XVI, dealing with germaneness. This waiver is necessary because the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee added a provision extending from 15 to 25 years the maximum terms of loans guaranteed to railroads under the Interstate Commerce Act. This

provision is not germane to the basic bill dealing with high-speed ground transportation. Second, the rule waives all points of order for failure to comply with clause 4, rule XXI, covering transfers of funds. This waiver is necessary because the bill includes a number of new programs and some funds already appropriated may be used on these new programs.

In addition, the rule makes it in order to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill, S. 979, and insert the House-passed language.

The primary purpose of H.R. 11384 is to extend the High-Speed Ground Transportation Act, and to authorize additional funds for 3 years.

The bill removes the termination provision from the act, but not the annual authorizations, and provides new authorizations for fiscal years 1973, 1974, and 1975. Important provisions contained in this extension will enable the Secretary of Transportation to coordinate the interlocking of transportation modes in research, development, and demonstrations under this act, and will require him to consider areas of high unemployment in entering into contracts under those programs. For example, two of the major programs under this bill will be, first, reworking the Metroliners running between Washington and New York, and second, development and testing of a tracked air-cushion research vehicle. In addition, the bill extends from 15 to 25 years the maximum terms of loans to railroads guaranteed under the act.

The cost authorized in this bill would be \$97 million for fiscal year 1973, \$126 million for fiscal year 1974, and \$92.2 million for fiscal year 1975. Previous appropriations under the High-Speed Ground Transportation Act were \$18,250,000 in 1966, \$22 million in 1967, \$11,750,000 in 1968, \$13 million in 1969, \$11 million in 1970, \$18 million in 1971, and \$25 million in 1972.

The report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce contains two letters from the Department of Transportation supporting the enactment of this type of legislation. However, with regard to the provisions requiring the Secretary to consider areas of high unemployment in entering into contracts, the Department notes that:

It is more appropriate to consider the labor surplus areas issue as part of our overall economic strategy and not in the context of this particular bill. This is the approach which this administration is taking.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11384) to extend the act of September 30, 1965, relating to high-speed ground transportation, by enlarging the authority of the Secretary

to undertake research and development removing the termination date thereof, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 11384 with Mr. ST GERMAIN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself whatever time I may use.

In 1965 Congress enacted the High Speed Ground Transportation Act. Under the act the Secretary of Transportation, consistent with the objective of promoting a safe, adequate, economical, and efficient national transportation system was authorized to undertake research and development and demonstrations in high speed ground transportation, including but not limited to components, such as materials, aerodynamics, vehicle propulsion, vehicle control, communications, and guideways. In enacting this legislation, the Congress recognized the need for the development of a balanced transportation system for this Nation and a need for updating and improving our surface transportation and in particular our Nation's railroads. However, the authority for this program terminates at the end of the fiscal year 1972. In addition, H.R. 11384 would authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1973, 1974, and 1975 to fund the further development and implementation of this program. This program of research and development and demonstrations in high speed ground transportation is a major effort to advance this Nation's technical capability to transport people and material to meet the growing needs of our society.

With improvements possible in existing systems, we should be able to achieve safe and comfortable passenger travel at speeds of 150 miles per hour. The movement of freight with greater efficiency and speed and with scheduled regularity should also be attained with attendant economies to the public. The programs conducted by the Federal Railroad Administration provide a basis for increasing the use of currently underutilized elements of our transportation system and provide for substantial growth capability, lessening the congestion on our roads and airways and with less environmental impact.

The technology developed in many of these programs is generally appropriate to intercity and urban rapid transit. The specific application of the technology will, of course, vary, taking into account the particular requirements and economies of the case.

This program is the Nation's principal effort to make advances in a balanced fashion in the performance of existing ground transportation systems as well as provide the basis for major advances in transportation technology. It is the belief of your committee that continued efforts are needed in this area to insure the vitality of the system.

Briefly, the bill as reported by the committee would do the following:

Section 1(a) would amend the High Speed Ground Transportation Act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to undertake a coordinated program of research and development in door-to-door ground transportation as well as high speed ground transportation. Additionally, section 1(b) would amend the act to authorize the Secretary to contract for demonstrations of interlocking door-to-door and high speed ground demonstrations to determine their contributions to a more efficient, safe, and economical intercity transportation system.

Section 2(a) would amend the act to require the Secretary of Transportation to give consideration to proposed contracts which will increase employment in labor areas with a high unemployment rate. This requirement would apply to those labor areas as defined by the Secretary of Labor in title 41 of the Code of Federal Regulations which are experiencing a rate of unemployment of 9 percent or more of the area's work force, or a rate of unemployment of 150 percent or more of the federally determined unemployment rate for the entire United States, or which have experienced a 1-percent increase in unemployment as determined by the Secretary of Labor of the available work force as a result of a termination of federally financed or supported programs.

Section 3 would amend the act to authorize appropriations of not to exceed \$97 million for fiscal year 1973; \$125 million for fiscal year 1974; and \$92,200,000 for fiscal year 1975. Substantial portions of these funds are for the development and testing of prototypes of advanced concepts of rail transportation.

Section 4 repeals section 12 of the High Speed Ground Transportation Act and thereby removes the termination date presently contained in the act.

Section 5 would amend sections 504 and 505 of the Interstate Commerce Act to extend the maximum terms of loans guaranteed by the Interstate Commerce Commission under part V of the Interstate Commerce Act from 15 years to 25 years. In making these amendments to the Interstate Commerce Act, your committee recognizes that several railroads which have received loan guarantees pursuant to this act are faced in the very near future with sizable payments on these loans and are not financially able to meet these payments. If these railroads are not able to extend the maturity dates of these loans, a default would result and require the Federal Government to make good on its guarantee. Accordingly, your committee believes that the extension of the maturity period for an additional 10 years will be in the best interests of the Government.

Section 6 would add a new section 510 to part V of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Subsection (a) of the new section would authorize the Comptroller General to audit financial transactions of railroads which have received loan guarantees under this section, in any case where the loan is still outstanding, or where payment has been made by the United States as a result of the guarantee. The Comptroller General is to have access to all books and papers necessary to make an audit.

Subsection (b) of the new section requires the Comptroller General to report to Congress, with a copy to the ICC, of the results of each audit made, showing the financial condition of the railroad, and any expenditures of the railroad or other financial transaction which may lessen the protection afforded the United States at the time the guarantee was made.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, section 2 of the basic act authorizes the Secretary to contract for demonstrations. It further provides that such demonstrations shall be designed to measure and evaluate certain factors. Among the factors now contained in that provision of the law is "variation in fares." That language is now in the law.

I have been very much concerned, as I know other Members have, about the hardship on the elderly, who are living on fixed incomes, in paying the fares. There have been projects carried on in some parts of the country, New York City for instance, to provide that senior citizens may travel on mass transit at a reduced fare or half fare.

I am asking the Chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia, if it is his understanding that the Secretary should evaluate the question of reduced fares for the elderly in conducting demonstration projects. As I pointed out, the present law lists variations in fares as a factor to be evaluated.

Mr. STAGGERS. I would say that there is a bill which is coming up next week, possibly, that this would fit into appropriately, but I agree with the gentleman from New York that what he proposes could certainly be carried out by the Secretary of Transportation under section 2 of the High Speed Ground Transportation Act.

Mr. RYAN. I would appreciate the support of the gentleman to accomplish this objective on the bill next week.

Mr. STAGGERS. When that time comes we will certainly take a look at what the gentleman is suggesting. I know what the gentleman is trying to do is worthwhile.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, there are six points that this bill would cover, and they are as follows:

First. The bill provides a 3-year extension with authorizations of \$97 million for the fiscal year 1973, \$125 million for the fiscal year 1974, and \$92.2 million for

the fiscal year 1975. Total authorizations are \$315.2 million.

Second. The purpose of the act, first passed in 1965, is to carry out research in new methods of surface transportation and to carry out demonstration projects.

Third. The termination date for the research activity is removed but the money is still held to 3 years.

Fourth. Projects are to include efforts to tie together interstate and local transportation systems—referred to as door-to-door research.

Fifth. Areas of high unemployment will be considered for projects.

Sixth. Unrelated to the other provisions the bill extends maximum payment time for title V loans from 15 to 25 years.

Mr. Chairman, I might point out further that we have received a memorandum from the Department of Transportation that points out the following:

The electrified Metroliners running between Washington and New York carried nearly three and one-half million passengers between April of 1969 and December of 1971. And the TurboTrain between Boston to New York not only has good ridership but has shown us that aerospace technology can be put to very practical use on the ground.

The need for this type of facility is, I believe, only too obvious if you look at some of the staggering predictions of transportation problems for the next twenty years. By 1990 America's population will be closer to 300 million than the some 200 million we now have. By then eighty-five percent of our population will live in urban areas. By then our highways will have more than 170 million vehicles on them compared to 100 million today, and airplanes will be discharging enormous crowds of people at our airports at a much faster rate than they do now.

So it would appear, Mr. Chairman, that this bill is something that we need to look at because sometimes we refrain from taking into account what will happen in the future, and are not prepared for such events.

I believe this is a necessary piece of legislation. It was supported unanimously in our committee.

Further, Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this legislation is to extend the act of 1965 relating to high speed ground transportation; to enlarge the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to undertake research and development and to authorize additional appropriations for a 3-year period.

The High Speed Ground Transportation Act is now 6 years old. Appropriations totaling \$119 million have been made for its purpose to date. Unless the act is extended, it will terminate on June 30, 1972.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the Congress recognized in 1965 the urgent need for technological advancements in surface transportation to meet the requirements of densely populated areas of our country.

During the short span of years the program has been in existence the Federal Railroad Administration and the Department of Transportation have recorded several major accomplishments. Among the more dramatic is the introduction and continued operation of the Metroliners, the success of which dates

from the first day of operation and which has shown there is a real demand for improved rail passenger service. The turbo-trains which operate mostly between New York and Boston using an aeroplane type of engine also contributed to improved rail passenger technology. Perhaps of greatest importance are the joint projects in railroad technology providing for the first time cooperation between industry and government in railroad research and development.

It is this joint venture which will eventually develop the system which can best meet the requirements of other heavily populated corridors in various parts of our country and improve those presently in operation.

The Metroliner program has shown that even modest improvement in rail passenger equipment and service can attract substantial increased traffic. It is not unreasonable to believe that technology and systems being developed by the Federal Railroad Administration will in the future make even greater improvements and will increasingly meet the passenger transportation needs of the future.

Our committee bill also requires the Secretary in awarding contracts for design or manufacture of equipment and for the construction of facilities to give consideration to proposed contracts which will provide jobs in labor areas experiencing persistently high rates of unemployment.

The reported legislation also repeals the termination date of the act and authorizes annual appropriations as follows: not to exceed \$97 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; not to exceed \$126 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; and not to exceed \$92,200,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

Our Nation's surface passenger transportation systems have been operating with but few technological changes during the last 50 years. We should be encouraged by the technological successes of the last 6 years and look forward to meeting our future needs. I recommend passage of this legislation.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. JARMAN), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, as congestion around airports and on the highways increased, as noise and air pollution caused growing concern, and as the requirement for proper land use became evident, the need for ground transportation to play its full role in a balanced national transportation system became evident. In answer to these needs, Congress in 1965 passed the High Speed Ground Transportation Act—Public Law 89-220—to authorize research, development, and demonstrations of improved railroad technology and to explore the potential of new technologies. In the 6 years that this program has been in existence, there have been many major accomplishments. While much research and development has been accomplished, there still remains a need to develop the hardware necessary to implement the results of this research and

development, and to test the new concepts. That is why the program is being made permanent and why a 3-year authorization is being provided. That is also why the authorizations are substantially greater than in the past. The hardware phase is far more costly than the initial research efforts.

Many of the Members of the House are familiar with the favorable results of the Metroliner and turbotrain demonstrations which have shown that there is a real demand for improved rail service in the country. Another major accomplishment is the completion of a study of the transportation requirements in the Northeast Corridor of the United States. The High Speed Ground Test Center at Pueblo, Colo., has been put into initial operation for advanced high-speed intercity ground transportation and rail transit testing. Completion of the testing contemplated at the Pueblo center will result in increased safety in freight and passenger rail transportation. In this connection railroad track measuring instrumentation systems have been developed which will make possible improved understanding of the wheel/rail interactions. Similarly, an obstacle detection system is under development which has already had major technology spin-offs in the field of safety. In terms of advanced concepts, tunneling research and development has been undertaken to explore new approaches to reducing the cost of tunnel construction. Substantial developments have been made in the area of tracked air-cushion technology to the point where the early British and French lead is rapidly disappearing. The first large-scale linear induction motor has been built and preliminary testing completed to verify theoretical analysis. This project has provided the propulsion systems for the urban tracked air-cushion vehicle developments and may well be the propulsion system of the 1980's.

While the accomplishments to date in the high-speed ground transportation are substantial, it is evident that much more needs to be done. What is necessary is the testing of these advanced concepts. In this connection, the Federal Railroad Administration—FRA—program for the next 3 years includes the completion of the wheel rail dynamics laboratory, and the development of improved track test cars which should have important payoffs in terms of improved rail safety. Most importantly, FRA plans to test its tracked air-cushion vehicle and the linear induction motor system. We are now at the time where these advanced concepts are leaving the drawing board and becoming prototypes to be tested and evaluated. This testing and implementation is the critical juncture in the research efforts undertaken to date.

The continuation of this program will bring into use a number of the foregoing research efforts and provide for the initial phases of development and testing of these projects. The next few years should afford a sufficient amount of experience to determine which of the advanced systems considered are practical and economically feasible. Only the test-

ing of these systems will give this experience.

In addition, the legislation authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to coordinate high speed ground and door-to-door transportation, R. & D. and demonstration programs. I believe the need for such coordination is evident to any traveling by air or rail. In overall terms, what is accomplished by speeding a traveler from New York to Washington on the Metroliner at 90 or 100 miles an hour if he spends almost as much time getting from Union Station to his home in the suburbs? I should emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that it is not our intention through this amendment to get into the field of urban mass transportation. That falls within the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee. Our purpose is to see that the intercity high speed ground transportation program under Public Law 89-220 is coordinated with the activities being carried on under the urban mass transportation program.

The bill also amends part V of the Interstate Commerce Act which was a program which terminated in 1963 under which the Interstate Commerce Commission guaranteed loans to certain railroads. The maximum period for repayment of such loans was 15 years. Payments are now falling due and some railroads are not able to make them. Section 5 of the bill would extend the maximum period for repayment of those loans to 25 years. It is hoped that this will permit those railroads to renegotiate these loans, stretch out their payments, and make good on their obligations and thus avoid throwing those railroads into bankruptcy which would require the United States to pay off the amount of default on these guaranteed loans.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this legislation serves the public interest and hope that it will be passed by the House.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUYKENDALL).

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Chairman, first I wish to congratulate the chairman and the ranking members of the committee and of the subcommittee for the extension of this very worthwhile legislation.

In January I had the opportunity of visiting the test site in Pueblo, Colo., for quite some time. And I can say with all conviction that I have never seen a more dedicated group of people making Federal dollars stretch so far and do so much.

The 3½ million riders that Mr. NELSEN spoke of who have already used the Metroliner are people who, were it not for high-speed ground transportation, would be in the air and on the highways between here and New York and California and around the country.

When most of us hear of high-speed ground transportation these days, we think of the Tokaido in Japan or the Metroliner. But the people at Pueblo are doing something else. They are experimenting with everything, even the newest subway cars in New York City that get out there immediately after they come off the production line and are tested even before they go into service. And

the Department of Transportation, in conjunction with private industry, has already functioning the prototype locomotive that will produce speeds up to 300 miles an hour on the ground with no pollution and no noise.

These are the things that will be commonplace by 1990 or 2000.

Before this year is over, we will see demonstrated in Pueblo the tracked air cushion research vehicle which uses the revolutionary linear induction motor. These are the vehicles that will relieve the pressure on our airways and highways and will enable people to travel on the ground between cities at a speed well over 200 miles an hour.

This sort of work not only is practical for today—look at the success of the Metroliner or the TurboTrain for example—but they are looking forward to producing high-speed transportation on the ground in comfort, with no noise, no pollution, in the neighborhood of 300 miles an hour. That technology will be on demonstration in Pueblo before this year is over.

I do not recommend this particular site as a tourist attraction. There is some beautiful scenery in Colorado a few miles from there, but the test site is on desert land that is not needed or good for anything else—and I am glad they did not buy a lot of high-priced real estate—but I urge any Member of the Congress to go and see what they are doing at this site, and to get a look at the high-speed transportation problems and solutions of the future.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE).

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, when the Office of High Speed Ground Transportation was created, I was privileged to serve on the subcommittee which worked out this original legislation. And I was a member of the conference committee which drafted the bill in its final form.

Naturally, I feel very much a part of this program.

Naturally, I have followed its progress with more than passing interest.

And, quite naturally, I join today in support of this legislation.

I have tried to translate my interest into action. For example, I have visited the Pueblo test site; I have walked the ground and talked with the engineers. And I have come away impressed with this limited beginning. Two years ago, I tried to get \$15 million additional funds for the Office of High Speed Ground Transportation. However, my amendment which was offered on the floor of the House was defeated by representatives of this administration.

Through the years, I have watched this program develop from only a concept to actual construction. And, as a result, I cannot help but regret that at times it seems that redtape is traveling faster than the program we created. Always we have been underfinanced, with the predictable result: the project moves too slow.

I endorse the committee bill today because it combines money with more muscle for the Office of High Speed.

Particularly, I support the provision

which authorizes the Secretary to implement the interlocking of transportation modes in research and development and demonstrations in door-to-door and high-speed ground transportation, to determine the contributions that they could make to a more efficient, safe, and economical intercity transportation system.

Mr. Chairman, this coordination obviously is needed.

It is needed not only in the Office of High Speed Ground Transportation, but throughout the whole of DOT operations.

I recognize that I am switching subjects, but this subject of coordination cannot be taken too lightly. For this reason, six members of the Transportation and Aeronautics Subcommittee and I have introduced legislation which would provide coordination for all the research and development, all planning and all demonstration done by DOT.

This legislation, called the Transportation Development Act of 1972, would place under one central administration within DOT all the research and development, planning, and demonstration projects. This agency would be on an equal footing with the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Aviation Administration, and other individual agencies within the DOT.

This would be done, Mr. Chairman, in the firm conviction that we have passed the point in time whereby we can just go out and build a new highway or airport—independent of other modes of transportation. Now—and no later than now—we must consider the impact that each system has on the other.

Although there is a sincere effort within the DOT to develop and coordinate these various agencies, there is no clear coordination, no real authority, no real muscle. There is no substantial national transportation policy.

I do not mean to criticize the work these separate agencies have done. Some of their work has great significance. Some of their work directly affects the other agencies.

I criticize what they have not done. They have not coordinated enough. I complain not about the people—but about the system.

I repeat my earlier support of the Office of High Speed Ground Transportation. However, as its name implies, it is dealing with high speed ground transportation only. And most of this is with rail type vehicles.

This is good. But this in itself and by itself is not enough. We must begin to think in terms of integrated transportation systems, each complementing the other while still competing with the other.

Under H.R. 13135, a new Transportation Development Administration would be set up within the DOT to function at the same level in the "pecking order" with such current agencies as the Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Railroad Administration, and Urban Mass Transit Administration.

The Administrator of this proposed new agency would be responsible for all research, development, planning, and

demonstration—except by the Maritime Administration.

The plan envisioned in this bill makes no attempt to change the present operation of the highway trust fund or the airport trust fund. The other existing Administrations would be in charge of their own actual operations and would continue to administer capital grant programs.

What the proposed TDA would do would be to coordinate all such activities and to provide a sense of direction toward the development of a clear national transportation system.

To insure future coordination, 2 years after the effective enactment of this bill, the Secretary of Transportation shall not approve studies pertaining to technological assessment and forecasting, transportation priorities, regional or carrier development, feasibility or technological development—nor shall the Secretary approve research, development projects involving the study, design, construction, trials, acceptance, and introduction of new or improved transportation systems unless they have been coordinated through the Transportation Development Administration.

This plan would not mean a reduction in spending for transportation development activities, but would actually call for greater appropriations. Moreover, through coordination, we will get more value from the money we are now spending or will spend in the future.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman from Texas is a valuable member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and was a most valuable member of the Transportation Subcommittee. We miss him there very much. I must say that the point which he has made at this particular time is one which merits the most careful consideration of the Congress. I wish to agree with the gentleman, support what he is doing, and associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. PICKLE. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

If we are going to find new ways to move goods and people, we must start at a beginning, namely, putting all research and development under one agency. I call upon the Department of Transportation to give us their support on this new proposed legislation. We in effect will be giving them the muscle and the power to bring all types of research and development together. Until that time, a great deal of the money we are spending on Amtrak and other projects is simply holding the line and keeping those things together rather than finding the real answer that we must have. The answer can be found in the establishment of a Transportation Development Administrative within the Department of Transportation. I call on the Members to give this forthcoming measure their full support.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, there is much that needs to be done by this Congress if we are to lay the foundation for more adequate urban transit systems.

Extension of the High Speed Ground Transportation Act represents a modest, but important step in the right direction. While intercity transit is the most direct beneficiary, some of the testing of new transit technologies authorized by this act should be applied to the types of new systems which we need in our cities. This extension will also permit us for the first time to explore means of interlocking urban transit systems with the new intercity systems under development.

A total of \$119 million has been appropriated for this program since its adoption in 1965. This extension will authorize additional appropriations totaling \$315,200,000 over the next 3-year period. I hope we will fully fund this program. We cannot permit the glow of good feeling which surrounds the passage of this bill blind us to the need to actually make the funds available when the time comes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, a great deal of attention has been focused on railroad passenger service in the last few years. Its prospects and its future development have taken on the aspects of a national debate. The removal of passenger service from the regular railroad carriers to the newly formed corporation now known as Amtrak changed the nature of the debate, but hardly settled it. The prognosis for passenger service is at best guarded and the reasons why are varied.

One thing about the future of railroad passenger service is pretty well agreed upon. Unless we are able to find new and better equipment and revolutionary systems of propulsion, there is no hope. If new, fast, comfortable and economical service systems can be discovered and used, some passenger service will not only survive, but may prosper. This was a recognizable fact before Amtrak was invented and it still is a fact. And that is really the story of what the high-speed ground transportation legislation has been about since 1965, when it was first enacted.

This is a research effort coupled with authority for demonstrating new technology. The Metroliner and the Turbo-train are examples of demonstration activities which are in progress and from which much is being learned. Those projects are trying to make the most out of what technology is readily available. They are not ultimate answers. Much better systems are necessary.

Since the beginnings in 1965 much has been accomplished and much information has been developed. There is a test facility in Pueblo, Colo., where revolutionary types of propulsion are under test. Without trying to explain the technical side of these issues and ideas, because I cannot, let me just mention them. The tracked air-cushioned vehicle may very well resolve some of the problems caused by deteriorating roadbeds without the very high cost of complete rebuilding of the right-of-way. Linear induction motors may be able to pull these vehicles around at high speed with little fuss and great comfort. These and other innovations in surface transportation are well along and could revolutionize the passenger business within a few years.

To carry out this research the bill provides for a total of \$315.2 million over the next 3 years. Although the money is limited to this period of time, the authority to proceed with the activities is not so limited and it is expected that it shall continue until results are obtained.

I recommend that the House approve this bill.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. Extending the life of the High Speed Ground Transportation Act for 3 years and strengthening its budget, the bill would carry forward a score of research and demonstration projects aimed at balancing the country's transportation system. The bill calls for an authorization of \$97 million during fiscal 1973, more than four times the fiscal 1972 budget—indeed, more than 80 percent of the total \$119 million spent under the High Speed Ground Transportation Act since it went into effect in 1968. The authorization for fiscal 1974 would reach \$126 million, and, for fiscal 1975—when research experts anticipate a less pressing need for funds—\$92.2 million.

The need for a renewed commitment to this program is obvious. The country's surface transportation systems—its rail systems, in particular—have lagged far behind the technological advances in other fields. In fact, as the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee points out in its report, the systems have been mired in the same drearily familiar patterns for the past half century. At a time when space travel has become almost routine, our modes of surface transportation are still relics of the horse-and-buggy era. Everyone is familiar with the railway problem: the capricious schedules, the grimy and airless cars, the sullen ticket agents, the abandoned routes. Driving a car in the inner city—indeed, even on many highways—is equally harrowing. Traffic jams grow more frequent and more infuriating year by year.

What we need, Mr. Chairman, is a roundly balanced transportation system—one that smoothly integrates the modes of air, rail, car and bus travel.

Swift and efficient means of ground transportation, both intercity and intracity, are among our highest priorities in working for that balance.

The High Speed Ground Transportation Act has already led to some heartening breakthroughs:

First. A completion of a study of transportation requirements in the Northeast Corridor of the United States.

Second. A Metroliner demonstration which has shown a real demand for improved rail passenger service.

Third. A Turbo-train demonstration which has demonstrated improved rail passenger technology.

Fourth. A High Speed Ground Test Center at Pueblo, Colo., has been put into initial operation for advanced high speed intercity ground transportation and rail transit testing.

Fifth. Tunneling research and development has been undertaken to explore new approaches to reducing the cost of tunnel construction.

Sixth. A railroad track measuring instrumentation system has been developed which will make possible improved

understanding of the wheel in rail interactions and could lead to improvements to the entire national rail network track-age.

Seventh. An obstacle detection system is under development which has already had a major technology spinoff in the field of security.

Eighth. Tracked air cushion technology has been advanced to the point where the early British and French lead is rapidly disappearing.

Ninth. A network control system is under development which appears to be the most promising control system for a number of ground systems, including the dual mode vehicle for urban application.

Tenth. The first large-scale linear electric motor has been built and preliminary testing completed to verify theoretical analysis. This project has provided the propulsion system for the urban TACV developments and may well be the propulsion system of the 1980's.

Eleventh. There are joint projects in railroad technology under way providing for the first time industry/Government cooperation in railroad research and development.

The bill now before us would continue these projects and give rise to new ones.

One provision of the bill, Mr. Chairman, deserves special note here. It directs the Secretary of Transportation to give every consideration to areas of high unemployment in awarding contracts for the manufacture of equipment or the construction of facilities. Chairman STAGGERS has pointed out that cutbacks in Federal spending have caused sudden and dramatic unemployment in many areas of the country, leaving millions of highly skilled and highly motivated people without jobs. In my own congressional district—largely within the Springfield-Holyoke-Chicopee metropolitan area—these cutbacks have played a major role in driving the unemployment rate up to nearly 9 percent.

This is a sound bill, recognizing the country's economic plight as well as its transportation plight.

I urge its passage.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 11384, to extend the High Speed Ground Transportation Act for 3 years with a total additional authorization of \$315,200,000.

First enacted in 1965, this legislation mandated the Secretary of Transportation with undertaking research, development, and demonstrations in high-speed surface transportation, and it has proved to be a keystone in meeting our transportation needs for the future.

In the New England area, for example, it has made possible a thorough Department of Transportation study of transportation requirements in the northeast corridor. It has also made possible the successful Turbotrain run between Boston and New York, and the popular Metroliner between New York and Washington. These two lines have not only demonstrated improved high-speed technology, but have revealed the

demand for this mode of passenger travel.

In the area of research and development, the High Speed Ground Transportation Act has funded such valuable projects as a test center, an obstacle detection system, and tracked air cushion technology research. In addition, the first large scale linear electric motor, a potential propulsion system of the 1980's, has been built through the funds authorized under this act.

The legislation before us today would permit the continuation of this essential research for 3 more years, and allow DOT to further develop our ability to meet future transportation needs. To carry out this goal, H.R. 11384 authorizes \$97,000,000 for fiscal 1973, \$126,000,000 for fiscal 1974, and \$92,200,000 for fiscal 1975.

Included in this authorization is a total of \$1.5 million for the Turbotrain demonstration run. It is clear that the Turbotrain between Boston and New York needs more funds than this for improvements in roadbeds and other areas, and I hoped that the Turbo would receive considerably more funding. The Metroliner by comparison is authorized \$17,200,000 under this legislation, for instance. At the same time, the \$1.5 million provided for the Turbotrain will at least allow DOT to continue its work on this demonstration, to improve cars and other equipment. I therefore support this section, but with the hope that considerable additional funds, essential to the future of the Turbotrain run, will be provided at some later date.

H.R. 11384 contains two unique sections which were not in the earlier High-Speed Ground Transportation Act passed by Congress. The first of these requires that the Secretary of Transportation, in awarding contracts in connection with research, development, and demonstration projects, give consideration to proposed contracts from labor areas which have substantial unemployment. This clause is by no means binding. However, it does call attention to the need for creating jobs in those areas in States like Connecticut, which have been particularly hard hit by unemployment.

The second section authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to explore the so-called door-to-door aspects of rail transportation, that is the relationship of urban transportation systems with intercity transportation systems such as the Turbotrain run. The long range goal is to improve the ease of transfer between urban and intercity transportation. The Department of Transportation has already begun some tentative studies in this area. It is hoped that this legislation will further encourage research in this direction.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, coming from a large urban community, I, like a great many other members here, have firsthand knowledge of the very vexing transportation problems afflicting every population center in the country, so I most earnestly urge and hope that this bill, H.R. 11384, designed to extend and enlarge the 1965 High Speed Ground Transportation Act, will be overwhelmingly approved here this afternoon.

My home city of Worcester, Mass., the third largest in New England, is increasingly plagued by inadequate transportation service and, as the pollution danger and traffic congestion daily grows, our population is made more acutely aware of the vital need to provide a safe, economic and balanced transportation system.

Indeed some limited but encouraging headway toward this objective was made under the provisions of the 1965 act. The Department of Transportation completed its northeast corridor transportation study and its developed impact could be made very helpful to the people of our area. Transportation Secretary John Volpe hailed the study as one of the most comprehensive analytical efforts ever undertaken in the challenging field of transportation. The Metroliner and Turbotrain demonstrations that were initiated between Boston, New York, and Washington very clearly indicated that there is a great public desire as well as a near desperate need for improved rail passenger service, and there is no question that the availability of such improved rail passenger service along the more densely-populated inland route from Boston, Framingham, Worcester, Springfield, New Haven and New York would inspire such a nearly universal use of these more modern rail passenger facilities that a profitable operation would be practically guaranteed.

This is the type of improved service and advanced rail technology that was projected when the research and development provisions of the 1965 act were accepted here. This measure before us now holds out an even greater hope for accelerated accomplishment of our eventual objective. For example, the substantial costs of upgrading railroad beds and track was cited as a reason for many national areas, including my own, not being given high speed rail transportation service. Under the provisions of this current proposal, the Department of Transportation's high speed ground test center in Colorado will conduct more exhaustive safety and economic efficiency studies on conventional railroad track and there is every reasonable expectation that these studies will be substantially more effective in bringing our improved service anticipations closer to reality.

Another appealing aspect of the bill before us is the esteemed Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee's recognition of the very urgent need for more efficient door-to-door service. In effect, the question has been posed and answered, of what benefit would be high-speed rail passenger service between, say, Boston and New York if the travel time saved between those stations is practically cancelled out by the delaying difficulties of getting to and from such stations, from the point of home origin to our final pleasure or business destination. Although the Department of Transportation made a good effort to deal with this question under the provisions of the previous act, I think we should commend and accept the new language and more complete answer the committee has inserted in this measure, which clarifies

and strengthens the Secretary's authority to completely link together intermodal transportation programs and demonstrations.

Last, but by no means least, this bill will provide some assistance in helping to solve the paramount problem of unemployment that so severely affects my district and a great number of other areas throughout the Nation. Under the terms of this bill, the Transportation Secretary will be required to give real consideration, in contract placement and awards, to the people and businesses in those areas that are experiencing an unfortunately high rate of unemployment. There are several very efficient businesses in my district and area, and I am sure in many, many others throughout the country, that are engaged in research and development of personalized rapid transit modes and methods and it is hoped that a good number of them can be given the opportunity, under this legislation, to help alleviate not only the great inconveniences associated with congested transportation, but also some of the cruel and discouraging hardships of wide unemployment.

Because I believe that this legislative proposal is unquestionably in the great national interest, that it is designed to meet a top priority need, and is a most prudent investment for the present as well as the future, I hope that it will be accepted and adopted by a very great majority of this House.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will read the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11384

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes", approved September 30, 1965 (49 U.S.C. 1631), is amended by inserting "and door-to-door ground transportation" immediately after "high-speed ground transportation".

(b) The first sentence of section 2 of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1632) is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary is authorized to contract for demonstrations to determine the contributions that high-speed ground transportation and door-to-door ground transportation could make to more efficient, safe, and economical intercity transportation systems."

Sec. 2. (a) Section 8(a) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1638(a)) is amended by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively, and by inserting immediately after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

(2) In awarding contracts for the design or manufacture of equipment, or for the construction of facilities, in connection with research and development and demonstration projects under this Act, the Secretary shall give consideration to proposed contracts which will increase employment in labor areas (as those areas are described by the Secretary of Labor in title 41 of the Code of Federal Regulations)—

"(A) which are experiencing a rate of unemployment of 9 per centum or more of the area's work force, or a rate of unemployment of 150 per centum or more of the federally determined unemployment rate for the entire United States; or

"(B) which have experienced a 1 per centum increase in unemployment, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, of the available work force as a result of the termination or reduction of a federally financed or supported program and such increase in unemployment continues to exist. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to require that any contract awarded under this Act must be wholly performed in any one labor area."

(b) Paragraph (3), as so redesignated by subsection (a) of this section, is amended to read as follows:

"(3) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the private agencies, institutions, organizations, corporations, and individuals with which the Secretary enters into agreements or contracts to carry out research and development under this Act shall, to the maximum extent practicable, be geographically distributed throughout the United States."

Sec. 3. The first sentence of section 11 of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1641) is amended by striking out "and" and by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "\$97,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; \$126,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; and \$92,200,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975."

Sec. 4. Section 12 of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1642) is repealed.

Sec. 5. (a) Section 504(a) (3) of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 1234(a) (3)) is amended by striking out "fifteen years after the date thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-five years after the date thereof".

(b) Section 505 of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 1235) is amended by inserting immediately after "renewal or extension of any such guaranty" the following: "for any period of time not exceeding twenty-five years from the date of the original guaranty".

Sec. 6. Part V of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 1231 et seq.) is amended by renumbering section 510 as section 511 and by inserting immediately after section 509 the following new section:

"AUDIT BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL"

"Sec. 510. (a) In any case in which—

"(1) there is outstanding any guaranty by the Commission made under this part; or

"(2) the Secretary of the Treasury is required to make any payment as a consequence of any guaranty by the Commission made under this part; the financial transactions of the common carrier by railroad subject to this Act with respect to which such guaranty was made may be audited by the Comptroller General of the United States under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe. The representatives of the Comptroller General shall have access to all books, accounts, records, reports, files, and other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by such common carrier by railroad pertaining to its financial transactions and necessary to facilitate the audit, and such representatives shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians."

"(b) A report of each such audit shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress. The report to the Congress shall contain such comments and information as the Comptroller General may deem necessary to inform the Congress of the financial operations and condition of the common carrier by railroad involved in such audit, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as he may deem advisable. The report shall also show specifically any pro-

gram, expenditure, or other financial transaction, or undertaking observed in the course of the audit, which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, adversely affects the financial operations or condition of the common carrier by railroad involved in such audit or lessens the protection afforded the United States at the time the original guaranty was made. A copy of each report shall be furnished to the Commission at the time it is submitted to the Congress."

Mr. STAGGERS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask somebody sponsoring this bill where it is proposed to get the money to continue to provide experiments of this kind. What are you out to do today with a \$315 million continuance of this program? Are you out to provide more comfortable and faster transportation to the bankruptcy courts and the poorhouse?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I will be glad to answer.

Mr. GROSS. In view of the fact that we are facing a \$40 billion deficit this fiscal year ending June 30, and are told that we will start with a \$25.5 billion written in, planned and admitted deficit in the budget for next fiscal year beginning July 1, where is it proposed to get the \$315 million for this purpose? I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. The answer to my good friend is that the taxpayers will be stuck with the bill.

Mr. GROSS. The taxpayers?

Mr. DINGELL. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows the taxpayers are already burdened to the breaking point with taxes. The money is going to be borrowed or printed. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. DINGELL. I do not propose to rise in denunciation of this administration and its fiscal policies, but I will be glad to listen while the gentleman is discussing those matters.

I am sure he will do an adequate job of it. But I do think the gentleman ought to recognize that this country has a major transportation crisis and unless we plan ahead to eliminate some of the transportation problems with which we are afflicted, the whole country will suffer.

Mr. GROSS. This country also has a first-class financial crisis staring it right in the face.

Mr. DINGELL. And if we do not cure the transportation crisis, we will not have the means for curing the financial crisis. That is the purpose of this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Moreover, this bill apparently puts a premium on unemployment. In other words, certain sections and areas of the country, where unemployment has become a way of life, will get the production to be financed by this bill. Even though other areas conduct their business properly and tax their people in order to hold down unemployment, they

are practically written out of the benefits of this legislation.

And I am getting fed up with this business of chairmen of committees coming in with bills without the slightest evidence as to where it is expected to get the money to finance them. I would be glad to hear from the chairman of the committee if he can tell me where it is expected to get this \$315 million, except by running the printing presses.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is making an important overall contribution to the problems of the Nation. I think most people recognize we are in difficulties financially. This is recognized. But this is an administration bill, and they set the figures in the bill themselves. We have brought that in. They have said if we can improve the transportation systems of America, then we can improve our economic systems also. I believe this. I believe the time has come when we must look ahead and try to do this in a businesslike way.

I would agree with the gentleman that this being in debt is bad for the country, but we cannot stop progress.

Mr. GROSS. We cannot stop what?

Mr. STAGGERS. Progress. This bill is to put into effect some progress.

Mr. GROSS. Is it progress to arrive at the poorhouse in a faster and more comfortable vehicle? Is that progress?

Mr. STAGGERS. The gentleman from Iowa is speaking in hypothetical terms.

Mr. GROSS. I am not speaking in hypothetical terms, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. STAGGERS. I have said I agree with the gentleman that the situation is serious, and I do agree with him on that.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman agree with me that the bill puts a premium on areas of unemployment?

Mr. STAGGERS. No.

We say they "would be considered," but we say it should be administered in this way. We say it shall be distributed geographically as evenly as it can be among the States.

Mr. GROSS. How long is it proposed to "consider" and continue the high-speed "demonstration" project between Washington and New York and Boston and New York? Does the gentleman have any idea how much longer that will go on?

Mr. STAGGERS. This is beyond the demonstration stage. This is put into actual use. We have most of the research done. That is what we want to do with most of the other modes. As I say, that is to be done with the air cushion on the track. If we can get that, we will have a modern system of transportation in America.

Mr. GROSS. We will never get any of this money back. It will be gone where the woodbine twineth, and the whang-doodle whangeth, and the gentleman knows it.

Let me ask the gentleman what the bill means by "door-to-door ground transportation."

Will citizens be transported door to door in Iowa?

Mr. STAGGERS. No.

Mr. GROSS. Of course not, because we have no passenger trains left out there. We will get the back of your hand out of this bill in Iowa. But what is door to door transportation? Do they pick up everybody door to door and transport them to other doors? What is the meaning of it?

Mr. STAGGERS. Well, it is explained in the report. I might say to the gentleman that what we are trying to do is have interlocking door to door. We do not just mean door to door; we mean into the streets of the areas where the transportation goes. For instance, when one comes into the Washington terminal, we mean that there will be transportation which will be acceptable and will take the person to different points of the city, that one can get to and get out of.

Mr. GROSS. It is not going to be door to door in West Virginia or Iowa, is it?

Mr. STAGGERS. No, sir.

Mr. GROSS. You bet your life it is not.

Mr. STAGGERS. No, sir.

Mr. GROSS. But we will get the opportunity to help put up the money if it is possible to dig it out of the taxpayers. They will put it up in West Virginia and Iowa, but the benefited areas will be where they make the equipment and where the trains will run after the equipment is put on the rails.

Mr. STAGGERS. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Just count me out on this kind of business.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to be proposed to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute? If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11384) to extend the act of September 30, 1965, relating to high-speed ground transportation, by enlarging the authority of the Secretary to undertake research and development, removing the termination date thereof, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 850, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to

the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 361, nays 14, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

YEAS—361

| | | |
|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Abbott | Dent | Ichord |
| Abernethy | Derwinski | Jacobs |
| Abourezk | Devine | Jarman |
| Abzug | Dickinson | Johnson, Calif. |
| Adams | Diggs | Johnson, Pa. |
| Addabbo | Dingell | Jones, Ala. |
| Alexander | Donohue | Jones, N.C. |
| Anderson, Calif. | Dorn | Jones, Tenn. |
| Anderson, Ill. | Dow | Karth |
| Archer | Dowdy | Kastenmeier |
| Arends | Downing | Kazen |
| Ashley | Drinan | Keating |
| Aspin | Dulski | Kee |
| Aspinall | du Pont | Keith |
| Badillo | Edmondson | Kemp |
| Baker | Edwards, Ala. | King |
| Barrett | Edwards, Calif. | Koch |
| Begich | Ellberg | Kuykendall |
| Belcher | Erlenborn | Kyl |
| Bell | Esch | Landrum |
| Bergland | Eshleman | Leggett |
| Betts | Evans, Colo. | Lennon |
| Bevill | Evins, Tenn. | Lent |
| Blaggi | Fascell | Link |
| Blester | Fish | Lloyd |
| Bingham | Fisher | Long, La. |
| Blackburn | Flood | Lujan |
| Blanton | Flowers | McClary |
| Boggs | Foley | McClure |
| Boland | Ford, Gerald R. | McCollister |
| Bolling | Ford, | McCormack |
| Bow | William D. | McCulloch |
| Brademas | Forsythe | McDade |
| Bray | Fountain | McEwen |
| Brinkley | Fraser | McFall |
| Brooks | Frelinghuysen | McKay |
| Broomfield | Frenzel | McKevitt |
| Brotzman | Fulton | McKinney |
| Brown, Mich. | Fuqua | Mahon |
| Brown, Ohio | Gallagher | Mailliard |
| Broyhill, N.C. | Garmatz | Mallory |
| Broyhill, Va. | Gaydos | Mathias, Calif. |
| Buchanan | Gettys | Matsunaga |
| Burke, Fla. | Glaimo | Mayne |
| Burke, Mass. | Gibbons | Mazzoli |
| Burleson, Tex. | Gonzalez | Meeds |
| Burlison, Mo. | Goodling | Melcher |
| Burton | Gray | Michel |
| Byrne, Pa. | Green, Oreg. | Mikva |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Green, Pa. | Miller, Calif. |
| Byron | Griffin | Miller, Ohio |
| Cabell | Griffiths | Mills, Ark. |
| Caffery | Grover | Mills, Md. |
| Carney | Gubser | Minish |
| Carter | Gude | Mink |
| Casey, Tex. | Hagan | Minshall |
| Cederberg | Haley | Mizell |
| Celler | Halpern | Mollohan |
| Chamberlain | Hamilton | Monagan |
| Chappell | Hammer- | Montgomery |
| Clancy | schmidt | Moorhead |
| Clark | Hanley | Morse |
| Clausen, | Hanna | Mosher |
| Don H. | Hansen, Idaho | Moss |
| Clawson, Del. | Hansen, Wash. | Murphy, III. |
| Cleveland | Harrington | Murphy, N.Y. |
| Collier | Harsha | Myers |
| Collins, Tex. | Harvey | Natcher |
| Colmer | Hastings | Nedzi |
| Conable | Hathaway | Nelsen |
| Conte | Hawkins | Nix |
| Conyers | Hays | Obey |
| Corman | Hechler, W. Va. | O'Konski |
| Cotter | Heckler, Mass. | Passman |
| Coughlin | Heinz | Patman |
| Culver | Helstoski | Patten |
| Curlin | Henderson | Pelly |
| Daniel, Va. | Hicks, Mass. | Pepper |
| Daniels, N.J. | Hicks, Wash. | Perkins |
| Danielson | Hillis | Pettis |
| Davis, Ga. | Hogan | Peyser |
| Davis, S.C. | Holifield | Pickle |
| Davis, Wis. | Horton | Pike |
| Delaney | Hosmer | Pirnie |
| Dellenback | Howard | Podell |
| Dellums | Hull | Poff |
| Denholm | Hungate | Preyer, N.C. |
| Dennis | Hunt | Price, Ill. |
| | Hutchinson | Price, Tex. |

Quie
Quillen
Rallsback
Randall
Rangel
Rees
Reid
Reusa
Rhodes
Roberts
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roush
Rousselot
Roy
Roybal
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
Sandman
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Saylor
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schwengel

Scott
Sebelius
Seiberling
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Smith, N.Y.
Spence
Staggers
Stanton
J. William
Stanton
James V.
Steed
Steele
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Stuckey
Sullivan
Symington
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Terry
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.

Thone
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Ware
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson
Charles H.
Winn
Wolf
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young, Fla.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zion
Zwack

NAYS—14

Bennett
Crane
de la Garza
Duncan
Findley

Flynt
Gross
Hall
Mathis, Ga.
Nichols

Rarick
Robinson, Va.
Runnels
Schmitz

NOT VOTING—56

Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews
Annunzio
Ashbrook
Baring
Blatnik
Brasco
Camp
Carey, N.Y.
Chisholm
Clay
Collins, Ill.
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edwards, La.
Frey
Gallfianakis
Goldwater
Grasso

Hébert
Jonas
Kluczynski
Kyros
Landgrebe
Latta
Long, Md.
McCloskey
McDonald,
Mich.
McMillan
Macdonald,
Mass.
Madden
Mann
Martin
Metcalfe
Mitchell
Morgan
O'Hara

O'Neill
Poage
Powell
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Purcell
Riegle
Rostenkowski
Shipley
Shoup
Springer
Stephens
Stokes
Stubblefield
Tiernan
Vanik
Veysey
Wampler
Wilson, Bob

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Collins of Illinois with Mr. Kyros.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Camp.
Mr. O'Hara with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Long of Maryland with Mr. Metcalfe.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Landgrebe.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Riegle.
Mrs. Grasso with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Vanik with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Shoup.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Veysey.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Wampler.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Gallfianakis.

Mr. CONYERS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The title was amended so as to read:
"A bill to amend the Act of September 30,

1965, relating to high-speed ground transportation, to enlarge the authority of the Secretary to undertake research and development, to remove the termination date thereof, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 850, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is discharged from further consideration of the bill S. 979.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STAGGERS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STAGGERS moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 979 and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 11384, as passed.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read:
"A bill to amend the Act of September 30, 1965, relating to high-speed ground transportation, to enlarge the authority of the Secretary to undertake research and development, to remove the termination date thereof, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 11384) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of the week, if any, and the schedule for next week.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the distinguished minority leader, this completes the program for this week, and I shall ask unanimous consent to go over until Monday after adjournment today.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday there will be a call of the Consent Calendar, to be followed by consideration of nine suspensions, as follows:

S. 1975, minimum age for Federal court jurors;

H.R. 2589, jury qualification form change;

Senate Joint Resolution 190, Commission on the Bankruptcy Laws Terms Extension;

H.R. 12828, veterans' education and training amendments;

S. 860, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

H.R. 12749, saline water conversion program;

H.R. 10390, Indian Claims Commission;

H.R. 8763, Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area; and

H.R. 10834, authorizing Alaska to operate a ferry.

Tuesday there will be a call of the Private Calendar, and also a motion to send to conference S. 659, the Omnibus Education Amendments of 1972, with Senate amendment thereto.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week there will be consideration of the following:

H.R. 11624, Transpo 72 at Dulles Airport, authorization, subject to a rule being granted;

H.R. 1746, Equal Employment Opportunities Act, a conference report; and

H.R. 10420, Marine Mammal Protection Act, subject to a rule being granted.

Conference reports, of course, may be called up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What is the future for that long list of Member bills which were killed off yesterday or the day before yesterday, whichever it was?

Mr. BOGGS. I am unable to answer the gentleman's inquiry. I have not discussed the matter with the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. I would think that the gentleman would be free to call them up again under unanimous consent, or, if necessary, to obtain rules.

I would not want to slow down any presidential candidate's campaign, but it might be helpful to know as soon as possible when we are going to be faced with that bunch of bills.

The gentleman might notice they are not called up for next Tuesday, at any rate.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the calendar Wednesday rule be

dispensed with on Wednesday of next week, March 8.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1746, EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTU- NITY ACT OF 1972

Mr. PERKINS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 1746) to further promote equal employment opportunities for American workers:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 92-899)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1746). An Act to further promote equal employment opportunities for American workers, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972".

Sec. 2. Section 701 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 253; 42 U.S.C. 2000e) is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a) insert "governmental, governmental agencies, political subdivisions," after the word "individuals".

(2) Subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The term 'employer' means a person engaged in an industry affecting commerce who has fifteen or more employees for each working day in each of twenty or more calendar weeks in the current or preceding calendar year, and any agent of such a person, but such term does not include (1) the United States, a corporation wholly owned by the Government of the United States, an Indian tribe, or any department or agency of the District of Columbia subject by statute to procedures of the competitive service (as defined in section 2102 of title 5 of the United States Code), or (2) a bona fide private membership club (other than a labor organization) which is exempt from taxation under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, except that during the first year after the date of enactment of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972, persons having fewer than twenty-five employees (and their agents) shall not be considered employers."

(3) In subsection (c) beginning with the semicolon strike out through the word "assistance".

(4) In subsection (e) strike out between "(A)" and "and such labor organization", and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-five or more during the first year after the date of enactment of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972, or (B) fifteen or more thereafter,".

(5) In subsection (f), insert before the period a comma and the following: "except that the term 'employee' shall not include any person elected to public office in any State or political subdivision of any State by the qualified voters thereof, or any person chosen by such officer to be on such officer's personal staff, or an appointee on the policy making level or an immediate adviser with respect to the exercise of the constitutional or legal powers of the office. The exemption set forth in the preceding sentence shall

not include employees subject to the civil service laws of a State government, governmental agency or political subdivision."

(6) At the end of subsection (h) insert before the period a comma and the following: "and further includes any governmental industry, business, or activity".

(7) After subsection (i) insert the following new subsection (j):

"(j) The term 'religion' includes all aspects of religious observance and practice, as well as belief, unless an employer demonstrates that he is unable to reasonably accommodate to an employee's or prospective employee's religious observance or practice without undue hardship on the conduct of the employer's business."

Sec. 3. Section 702 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 255; 42 U.S.C. 2000e-1) is amended to read as follows:

"EXEMPTION

"SEC. 702. This title shall not apply to an employer with respect to the employment of aliens outside any State, or to a religious corporation, association, educational institution, or society with respect to the employment of individuals of a particular religion to perform work connected with the carrying on by such corporation, association, educational institution, or society of its activities."

Sec. 4. (a) Subsections (a) through (g) of section 706 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 259; 42 U.S.C. 2000e-5(a)-(g)) are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 705. (a) The Commission is empowered, as hereinafter provided, to prevent any person from engaging in any unlawful employment practice as set forth in section 703 or 704 of this title.

"(b) Whenever a charge is filed by or on behalf of a person claiming to be aggrieved, or by a member of the Commission, alleging that an employer employment agency, labor organization, or joint labor-management committee controlling apprenticeship or other training or retraining, including on-the-job training programs, has engaged in an unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall serve a notice of the charge (including the date, place and circumstances of the alleged unlawful employment practice) on such employer, employment agency, labor organization, or joint labor-management committee (hereinafter referred to as the 'respondent') within ten days, and shall make an investigation thereof. Charges shall be in writing under oath or affirmation and shall contain such information and be in such form as the Commission requires. Charges shall not be made public by the Commission. If the Commission determines after such investigation that there is not reasonable cause to believe that the charge is true, it shall dismiss the charge and promptly notify the person claiming to be aggrieved and the respondent of its action. In determining whether reasonable cause exists, the Commission shall accord substantial weight to final findings and orders made by State or local authorities in proceedings commenced under State or local law pursuant to the requirements of subsections (c) and (d). If the Commission determines after such investigation that there is reasonable cause to believe that the charge is true, the Commission shall endeavor to eliminate any such alleged unlawful employment practice by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion. Nothing said or done during and as a part of such informal endeavor may be made public by the Commission, its officers or employees, or used as evidence in a subsequent proceeding without the written consent of the persons concerned. Any person who makes public information in violation of this subsection shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both. The Commission shall

make its determination on reasonable cause as promptly as possible and, so far as practicable, not later than one hundred and twenty days from the filing of the charge or, where applicable under subsection (c) or (d), from the date upon which the Commission is authorized to take action with respect to the charge.

"(c) In the case of an alleged unlawful employment practice occurring in a State, or political subdivision of a State, which has a State or local law prohibiting the unlawful employment practice alleged and establishing or authorizing a State or local authority to grant or seek relief from such practice or to institute criminal proceedings with respect thereto upon receiving notice thereof, no charge may be filed under subsection (a) by the person aggrieved before the expiration of sixty days after proceedings have been commenced under the State or local law, unless such proceedings have been earlier terminated, provided that such sixty-day period shall be extended to one hundred and twenty days during the first year after the effective date of such State or local law. If any requirement for the commencement of such proceedings is imposed by a State or local authority other than a requirement of the filing of a written and signed statement of the facts upon which the proceeding is based, the proceeding shall be deemed to have been commenced for the purposes of this subsection at the time such statement is sent by registered mail to the appropriate State or local authority.

"(d) In the case of any charge filed by a member of the Commission alleging an unlawful employment practice occurring in a State or political subdivision of a State which has a State or local law prohibiting the practice alleged and establishing or authorizing a State or local authority to grant or seek relief from such practice or to institute criminal proceedings with respect thereto upon receiving notice thereof, the Commission shall, before taking any action with respect to such charge, notify the appropriate State or local officials and, upon request, afford them a reasonable time, but not less than sixty days (provided that such sixty-day period shall be extended to one hundred and twenty days during the first year after the effective day of such State or local law), unless a shorter period is requested, to act under such State or local law to remedy the practice alleged.

"(e) A charge under this section shall be filed within one hundred and eighty days after the alleged unlawful employment practice occurred and notice of the charge (including the date, place and circumstances of the alleged unlawful employment practice) shall be served upon the person against whom such charge is made within ten days thereafter, except that in a case of an unlawful employment practice with respect to which the person aggrieved has initially instituted proceedings with a State or local agency with authority to grant or seek relief from such practice or to institute criminal proceedings with respect thereto upon receiving notice thereof, such charge shall be filed by or on behalf of the person aggrieved within three hundred days after the alleged unlawful employment practice occurred, or within thirty days after receiving notice that the State or local agency has terminated the proceedings under the State or local law, whichever is earlier, and a copy of such charge shall be filed by the Commission with the State or local agency.

"(f) (1) If within thirty days after a charge is filed with the Commission or within thirty days after expiration of any period of reference under subsection (c) or (d), the Commission has been unable to secure from the respondent a conciliation agreement acceptable to the Commission, the Commission may bring a civil action against any

respondent not a government, governmental agency, or political subdivision named in the charge. In the case of a respondent which is a government, governmental agency, or political subdivision, if the Commission has been unable to secure from the respondent a conciliation agreement acceptable to the Commission, the Commission shall take no further action and shall refer the case to the Attorney General who may bring a civil action against such respondent in the appropriate United States district court. The person or persons aggrieved shall have the right to intervene in a civil action brought by the Commission or the Attorney General in a case involving a government, governmental agency, or political subdivision. If a charge filed with the Commission pursuant to subsection (b) is dismissed by the Commission, or if within one hundred and eighty days from the filing of such charge or the expiration of any period of reference under subsection (c) or (d), whichever is later, the Commission has not filed a civil action under this section or the Attorney General has not filed a civil action in a case involving a government, governmental agency, or political subdivision, or the Commission has not entered into a conciliation agreement to which the person aggrieved is a party, the Commission, or the Attorney General in a case involving a government, governmental agency, or political subdivision, shall so notify the person aggrieved and within ninety days after the giving of such notice a civil action may be brought against the respondent named in the charge (A) by the person claiming to be aggrieved or (B) if such charge was filed by a member of the Commission, by any person whom the charge alleges was aggrieved by the alleged unlawful employment practice. Upon application by the complainant and in such circumstances as the court may deem just, the court may appoint an attorney for such complainant and may authorize the commencement of the action without the payment of fees, costs, or security. Upon timely application, the court may, in its discretion, permit the Commission, or the Attorney General in a case involving a government, governmental agency, or political subdivision, to intervene in such civil action upon certification that the case is of general public importance. Upon request, the court may, in its discretion, stay further proceedings for not more than sixty days pending the termination of State or local proceedings described in subsections (c) or (d) of this section or further efforts of the Commission to obtain voluntary compliance.

"(2) Whenever a charge is filed with the Commission and the Commission concludes on the basis of a preliminary investigation that prompt judicial action is necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Commission, or the Attorney General in a case involving a government, governmental agency, or political subdivision, may bring an action for appropriate temporary or preliminary relief pending final disposition of such charge. Any temporary restraining order or other order granting preliminary or temporary relief shall be issued in accordance with rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. It shall be the duty of a court having jurisdiction over proceedings under this section to assign cases for hearing at the earliest practicable date and to cause such cases to be in every way expedited.

"(3) Each United States district court and each United States court of a place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States shall have jurisdiction of actions brought under this title. Such an action may be brought in any judicial district in the State in which the unlawful employment practice is alleged to have been committed, in the judicial district in which the employment records relevant to such practice are maintained and administered, or in the judicial district in which

the aggrieved person would have worked but for the alleged unlawful employment practice, but if the respondent is not found within any such district, such an action may be brought within the judicial district in which the respondent has his principal office. For purposes of section 1404 and 1406 of title 28 of the United States Code, the judicial district in which the respondent has his principal office shall in all cases be considered a district in which the action might have been brought.

"(4) It shall be the duty of the chief judge of the district (or in his absence, the acting chief judge) in which the case is pending immediately to designate a judge in such district to hear and determine the case. In the event that no judge in the district is available to hear and determine the case, the chief judge of the district, or the acting chief judge, as the case may be, shall certify this fact to the chief judge of the circuit (or in his absence, the acting chief judge) who shall then designate a district or circuit judge of the circuit to hear and determine the case.

"(5) It shall be the duty of the judge designated pursuant to this subsection to assign the case for hearing at the earliest practicable date and to cause the case to be in every way expedited. If such judge has not scheduled the case for trial within one hundred and twenty days after issue has been joined, that judge may appoint a master pursuant to rule 53 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

"(g) If the court finds that the respondent has intentionally engaged in or is intentionally engaging in an unlawful employment practice charged in the complaint, the court may enjoin the respondent from engaging in such unlawful employment practice, and order such affirmative action as may be appropriate, which may include, but is not limited to, reinstatement or hiring of employees, with or without back pay (payable by the employer, employment agency, or labor organization, as the case may be, responsible for the unlawful employment practice), or any other equitable relief as the court deems appropriate. Back pay liability shall not accrue from a date more than two years prior to the filing of a charge with the Commission. Interim earnings or amounts earnable with reasonable diligence by the person or persons discriminated against shall operate to reduce the back pay otherwise allowable. No order of the court shall require the admission or reinstatement of an individual as a member of a union, or the hiring, reinstatement, or promotion of an individual as an employee, or the payment to him of any back pay, if such individual was refused admission, suspended, or expelled, or was refused employment or advancement or was suspended or discharged for any reason other than discrimination on account of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin or in violation of section 704(a)."

(b) (1) Subsection (i) of section 706 of such Act is amended by striking out "subsection (e)" and inserting in lieu thereof "this section".

(2) Subsection (j) of such section is amended by striking out "subsection (e)" and inserting in lieu thereof "this section".

Sec. 5. Section 707 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Effective two years after the date of enactment of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972, the functions of the Attorney General under this section shall be transferred to the Commission, together with such personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds employed, used, held, available, or to be made available in connection with such functions unless the President submits, and neither House of Congress

veto, a reorganization plan pursuant to chapter 9 of title 5, United States Code, inconsistent with the provisions of this subsection. The Commission shall carry out such functions in accordance with subsection (d) and (e) of this section.

"(d) Upon the transfer of functions provided for in subsection (c) of this section in all suits commenced pursuant to this section prior to the date of such transfer, proceedings shall continue without abatement, all court orders and decrees shall remain in effect, and the Commission shall be substituted as a party for the United States of America, the Attorney General, or the Acting Attorney General, as appropriate.

"(e) Subsequent to the date of enactment of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972, the Commission shall have authority to investigate and act on a charge of a pattern or practice of discrimination, whether filed by or on behalf of a person claiming to be aggrieved or by a member of the Commission. All such actions shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures set forth in section 706 of this Act."

Sec. 6. Subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 709 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 263; 42 U.S.C. 2000e-8(b)-(d)) are amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Commission may cooperate with State and local agencies charged with the administration of State fair employment practices laws and, with the consent of such agencies, may, for the purpose of carrying out its functions and duties under this title and within the limitation of funds appropriated specifically for such purpose, engage in and contribute to the cost of research and other projects of mutual interest undertaken by such agencies, and utilize the services of such agencies and their employees, and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, pay by advance or reimbursement such agencies and their employees for services rendered to assist the Commission in carrying out this title. In furtherance of such cooperative efforts, the Commission may enter into written agreements with such State or local agencies and such agreements may include provisions under which the Commission shall refrain from processing a charge in any cases or class of cases specified in such agreements or under which the Commission shall relieve any person or class of persons in such State or locality from requirements imposed under this section. The Commission shall rescind any such agreement whenever it determines that the agreement no longer serves the interest of effective enforcement of this title.

"(c) Every employer, employment agency, and labor organization subject to this title shall (1) make and keep such records relevant to the determinations of whether unlawful employment practices have been or are being committed, (2) preserve such records for such periods, and (3) make such reports therefrom as the Commission shall prescribe by regulation or order, after public hearing, as reasonable, necessary, or appropriate for the enforcement of this title or the regulations or orders thereunder. The Commission shall, by regulation, require each employer, labor organization, and joint labor-management committee subject to this title which controls an apprenticeship or other training program to maintain such records as are reasonably necessary to carry out the purposes of this title, including, but not limited to, a list of applicants who wish to participate in such program, including the chronological order in which applications were received, and to furnish to the Commission upon request, a detailed description of the manner in which persons are selected to participate in the apprenticeship or other training program. Any employer, employment agency, labor organization, or joint labor-management committee which believes that the application to it of any regulation or or-

der issued under this section would result in undue hardship may apply to the Commission for an exemption from the application of such regulation or order, and, if such application for an exemption is denied, bring a civil action in the United States district court for the district where such records are kept. If the Commission or the court, as the case may be, finds that the application of the regulation or order to the employer, employment agency, or labor organization in question would impose an undue hardship, the Commission or the court, as the case may be, may grant appropriate relief. If any person required to comply with the provisions of this subsection fails or refuses to do so, the United States district court for the district in which such person is found, resides, or transacts business, shall, upon application of the Commission, or the Attorney General in a case involving a government, governmental agency or political subdivision, have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring him to comply.

"(d) In prescribing requirements pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, the Commission shall consult with other interested State and Federal agencies and shall endeavor to coordinate its requirements with those adopted by such agencies. The Commission shall furnish upon request and without cost to any State or local agency charged with the administration of a fair employment practice law information obtained pursuant to subsection (c) of this section from any employer, employment agency, labor organization, or joint labor-management committee subject to the jurisdiction of such agency. Such information shall be furnished on condition that it not be made public by the recipient agency prior to the institution of a proceeding under State or local law involving such information. If this condition is violated by a recipient agency, the Commission may decline to honor subsequent requests pursuant to this subsection."

Sec. 7. Section 710 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 264; 42 U.S.C. 2000e-9) is amended to read as follows:

"INVESTIGATORY POWERS

"Sec. 710. For the purpose of all hearings and investigations conducted by the Commission or its duly authorized agents or agencies, section 11 of the National Labor Relations Act (49 Stat. 455; 29 U.S.C. 161) shall apply."

Sec. 8. (a) Section 703(a)(2) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 255; 42 U.S.C. 2000e-2(a)(2)) is amended by inserting the words "or applicants for employment" after the words "his employees."

(b) Section 703(c)(2) of such Act is amended by inserting the words "or applicants for membership" after the word "membership".

(c)(1) Section 704(a) of such Act is amended by inserting a comma and the following: "or joint labor-management committee controlling apprenticeship or other training or retraining, including on-the-job training programs," after "employment agency".

(2) Section 704(b) of such Act is amended by (A) striking out "or employment agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "employment agency, or joint labor-management committee controlling apprenticeship or other training or retraining, including on-the-job training programs," and (B) inserting a comma and the words "or relating to admission to, or employment in, any program established to provide apprenticeship or other training by such a joint labor-management committee" before the word "indicating".

(d) Section 705(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 253; 42 U.S.C. 2000e-4(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 705. (a) There is hereby created a Commission to be known as the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, which

shall be composed of five members, not more than three of whom shall be members of the same political party. Members of the Commission shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate for a term of five years. Any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed, and all members of the Commission shall continue to serve until their successors are appointed and qualified, except that no such member of the Commission shall continue to serve (1) for more than sixty days when the Congress is in session unless a nomination to fill such vacancy shall have been submitted to the Senate, or (2) after the adjournment sine die of the session of the Senate in which such nomination was submitted. The President shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Commission, and one member to serve as Vice Chairman. The Chairman shall be responsible on behalf of the Commission for the administrative operations of the Commission, and, except as provided in subsection (b), shall appoint, in accordance with the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, such officers, agents, attorneys, hearing examiners, and employees as he deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions and to fix their compensation in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates: *Provided*, That assignment, removal, and compensation of hearing examiners shall be in accordance with sections 3105, 3344, 5362, and 7521 of title 5, United States Code."

(e)(1) Section 705 of such Act is amended by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection (b):

"(b)(1) There shall be a General Counsel of the Commission appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of four years. The General Counsel shall have responsibility for the conduct of litigation as provided in sections 706 and 707 of this title. The General Counsel shall have such other duties as the Commission may prescribe or as may be provided by law and shall concur with the Chairman of the Commission on the appointment and supervision of regional attorneys. The General Counsel of the Commission on the effective date of this Act shall continue in such position and perform the functions specified in this subsection until a successor is appointed and qualified.

"(2) Attorneys appointed under this section may, at the direction of the Commission, appear for and represent the Commission in any case in court, provided that the Attorney General shall conduct all litigation to which the Commission is a party in the Supreme Court pursuant to this title."

(2) Subsections (e) and (h) of such section 705 are repealed.

(3) Subsections (b), (c), (d), (i), and (j) of such section 705, and all references thereto, are redesignated as subsections (c), (d), (e), (h), and (i), respectively.

(f) Section 705(g)(6) of such Act, is amended to read as follows:

"(6) to intervene in a civil action brought under section 706 by an aggrieved party against a respondent other than a government, governmental agency or political subdivision."

(g) Section 714 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"FORCIBLY RESISTING THE COMMISSION OR ITS REPRESENTATIVES

"Sec. 714. The provisions of sections 111 and 1114, title 18, United States Code, shall apply to officers, agents, and employees of the Commission in the performance of their official duties. Notwithstanding the provi-

sions of sections 111 and 1114 of title 18, United States Code, whoever in violation of the provisions of section 1114 of such title kills a person while engaged in or on account of the performance of his official functions under this Act shall be punished by imprisonment for any term of years or for life."

SEC. 9. (a) Section 5314 of title 5 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new clause:

"(58) Chairman, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission."

(b) Clause (72) of section 5315 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"(72) Members, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (4)."

(c) Clause (111) of section 5316 of such title is repealed.

(d) Section 5316 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new clause:

"(131) General Counsel of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission."

SEC. 10. Section 715 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COORDINATING COUNCIL

"Sec. 715. There shall be established an Equal Employment Opportunity Coordinating Council (hereinafter referred to in this section as the Council) composed of the Secretary of Labor, the Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Attorney General, the Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission, and the Chairman of the United States Civil Rights Commission, or their respective delegates. The Council shall have the responsibility for developing and implementing agreements, policies and practices designed to maximize effort, promote efficiency, and eliminate conflict, competition, duplication and inconsistency among the operations, functions and jurisdictions of the various departments, agencies and branches of the Federal Government responsible for the implementation and enforcement of equal employment opportunity legislation, orders, and policies. On or before July 1 of each year, the Council shall transmit to the President and to the Congress a report of its activities, together with such recommendations for legislative or administrative changes as it concludes are desirable to further promote the purposes of this section."

Sec. 11. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 253; 42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"NONDISCRIMINATION IN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT

"Sec. 717. (a) All personnel actions affecting employees or applicants for employment (except with regard to aliens employed outside the limits of the United States) in military departments as defined in section 102 of title 5, United States Code, in executive agencies (other than the General Accounting Office) as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code (including employees and applicants for employment who are paid from nonappropriated funds), in the United States Postal Service and the Postal Rate Commission, in those units of the government of the District of Columbia having positions in the competitive service, and in those units of the legislative and judicial branches of the Federal Government having positions in the competitive service, and in the Library of Congress shall be made free from any discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

"(b) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the Civil Service Commission shall have authority to enforce the provisions of subsection (a) through appropriate remedies, including reinstatement or hiring of employees with or without back pay, as

will effectuate the policies of this section, and shall issue such rules, regulations, orders and instructions as it deems necessary and appropriate to carry out its responsibilities under this section. The Civil Service Commission shall—

"(1) be responsible for the annual review and approval of a national and regional equal employment opportunity plan which each department and agency and each appropriate unit referred to in subsection (a) of this section shall submit in order to maintain an affirmative program of equal employment opportunity for all such employees and applicants for employment;

"(2) be responsible for the review and evaluation of the operation of all agency equal employment opportunity programs, periodically obtaining and publishing (on at least a semiannual basis) progress reports from each such department, agency, or unit; and

"(3) consult with and solicit the recommendations of interested individuals, groups, and organizations relating to equal employment opportunity.

The head of each such department, agency, or unit shall comply with such rules, regulations, orders, and instructions which shall include a provision that an employee or applicant for employment shall be notified of any final action taken on any complaint of discrimination filed by him thereunder. The plan submitted by each department, agency, and unit shall include, but not be limited to—

"(1) provisions for the establishment of training and education programs designed to provide a maximum opportunity for employees to advance so as to perform at their highest potential; and

"(2) a description of the qualifications in terms of training and experience relating to equal employment opportunity for the principal and operating officials of each such department, agency, or unit responsible for carrying out the equal employment opportunity program and of the allocation of personnel and resources proposed by such department, agency, or unit to carry out its equal employment opportunity program.

With respect to employment in the Library of Congress, authorities granted in this subsection to the Civil Service Commission shall be exercised by the Librarian of Congress.

"(c) Within thirty days of receipt of notice of final action taken by a department, agency, or unit referred to in subsection 717(a), or by the Civil Service Commission upon an appeal from a decision or order of such department, agency, or unit on a complaint of discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex or national origin, brought pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, Executive Order 11478 or any succeeding Executive orders, or after one hundred and eighty days from the filing of the initial charge with the department, agency, or unit or with the Civil Service Commission on appeal from a decision or order of such department, agency, or unit until such time as final action may be taken by a department, agency, or unit, an employee or applicant for employment, if aggrieved by the final disposition of his complaint, or by the failure to take final action on his complaint, may file a civil action as provided in section 706, in which civil action the head of the department, agency, or unit, as appropriate, shall be the defendant.

"(d) The provisions of section 706 (f) through (k), as applicable, shall govern civil actions brought hereunder.

"(e) Nothing contained in this Act shall relieve any Government agency or official of its or his primary responsibility to assure nondiscrimination in employment as required by the Constitution and statutes or of its or his responsibilities under Executive Order 11478 relating to equal employment opportunity in the Federal Government."

SEC. 12. Section 5108(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (9);

(2) striking out the period at the end of paragraph (10) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(3) by adding immediately after paragraph (10) the last time it appears therein in the following new paragraph:

"(11) the Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, subject to the standards and procedures prescribed by this chapter, may place an additional ten positions in the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 for the purposes of carrying out title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964."

SEC. 13. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 253; 42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SPECIAL PROVISION WITH RESPECT TO DENIAL, TERMINATION, AND SUSPENSION OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

"SEC. 718. No Government contract, or portion thereof, with any employer, shall be denied, withheld, terminated, or suspended, by any agency or officer of the United States under any equal employment opportunity law or order, where such employer has an affirmative action plan which has previously been accepted by the Government for the same facility within the past twelve months without first according such employer full hearing and adjudication under the provisions of title 5, United States Code, section 554, and the following pertinent sections: *Provided*, That if such employer has deviated substantially from such previously agreed to affirmative action plan, this section shall not apply; *Provided further*, That for the purposes of this section an affirmative action plan shall be deemed to have been accepted by the Government at the time the appropriate compliance agency has accepted such plan unless within forty-five days thereafter the Office of Federal Contract Compliance has disapproved such plan."

SEC. 14. The amendments made by this Act to section 706 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 shall be applicable with respect to charges pending with the Commission on the date of enactment of this Act and all charges filed thereafter.

And the Senate agree to the same.

CARL D. PERKINS,
JOHN H. DENT,
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,
PATSY T. MINK,
PHILLIP BURTON,
WM. L. (BILL) CLAY,
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS,
WILLIAM D. FORD,
MARIO BIAGGI,
ROMANO L. MAZZOLI,
ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,
JOHN BRADEMAS,
ALBERT H. QUIE,
JOHN N. ERLERNBORN,
ALPHONZO BELL,
MARVIN L. ESCH,
EARL F. LANDGREBE,
ORVAL HANSEN,
WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
JACK KEMP.

Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
CLAIBORNE PELL,
GAYLORD NELSON,
THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
ADLAI E. STEVENSON,
HAROLD E. HUGHES,
JACOB K. JAVITS,
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,
BOB PACKWOOD,
ROBERT TAFT, JR.,
ROBERT T. STAFFORD,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF MANAGERS AT THE CONFERENCE ON H.R. 1746 TO FURTHER PROMOTE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR AMERICAN WORKERS

The managers on the part of the House and Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1746) an Act to further promote equal employment opportunities for American workers, submit the following joint statement to the House and Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The points in disagreement and the conference resolution of them are as follows:

The House bill provided the short title "Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1971". The Senate amendment provided the short title "Equal Employment Opportunities Enforcement Act of 1972". The Senate receded with an amendment changing the date in the House provision to 1972.

Under the House bill, there was no provision for an expansion of coverage of Title VII.

The Senate amendment expanded coverage to include:

(1) State and local governments, governmental agencies, political subdivisions (except for elected officials, their personal assistants and immediate advisors) and the District of Columbia departments and agencies (except where such are subject by law to the Federal competitive service). State agencies previously covered by reference to the United States Employment Service continue to be covered; and

(2) employers who employ 15 or more full-time employees and labor organizations with 15 or more members beginning one year after enactment.

In addition, the Senate amendment included a new definition of "religion" to include all aspects of religious observance and practice, as well as belief, unless an employer demonstrates that he is unable to reasonably accommodate to an employee's or prospective employee's religious observance or practice without undue hardship on the conduct of the employer's business.

The House receded with an amendment exempting, in addition to State and local government elected officials, persons chosen by such officials to be on their personal staffs, appointees of such officials on a policymaking level or immediate advisors of such elected officials. The exemption does not include civil service employees.

It is the intention of the conferees to exempt elected officials and members of their personal staffs, and persons appointed by such elected officials as advisors or to policymaking positions at the highest levels of the departments or agencies of State or local governments, such as cabinet officers, and persons with comparable responsibilities at the local level. It is the conferees intent that this exemption shall be construed narrowly. Also, all employees subject to State or local civil service laws are not exempted.

The Senate amendment eliminated the present exemption from Title VII for educational institutions. Also, the Senate provision expanded the exemption for religious organizations from coverage under this title with respect to the employment of individuals of a particular religion in all their activities instead of the present limitation to religious activities. The House bill did not change the existing exemptions. The House receded.

Both the House bill and Senate amendment contained procedures for filing of charges. The Senate amendment provided for charges to be filed by or on behalf of a person claiming to be aggrieved, or by an officer or employee of the Commission upon request of any person claiming to be aggrieved. Charges were to be in writing under

oath or affirmation and in the specific form required by the Commission. The Senate amendment further provided that the Commission serve a notice of the charge including the date, place and circumstances of the alleged unlawful employment practice on the respondent within 10 days. Under the Senate amendment, the Commission would dismiss the charge if it determined after investigation that there was not reasonable cause to believe the charge was true and would be required to accord substantial weight to the decision of state and local authorities under state and local equal employment opportunity laws in making such reasonable cause determination. The Senate amendment also required the Commission to make its determination so far as practicable not later than 120 days from the date the Commission was authorized to act on the charge.

The House bill provided for charges to be filed by the person claiming to be aggrieved or by a member of the Commission if he had reasonable cause to believe a violation occurred. The Commissioner's charge had to set forth the facts upon which it was based and the person or persons aggrieved. The House bill also provided that the Commission furnish the respondent with a copy of the charge within five days. Both the House bill and the Senate amendment prohibited disclosure of anything said or done during informal conciliation efforts without the consent of the parties.

The Senate receded with an amendment providing that charges be filed by or on behalf of the person claiming to be aggrieved or by a member of the Commission, alleging that an unlawful employment practice occurred. Charges are to be in writing under oath for affirmation and in such form as the Commission requires. A notice of a charge including the date, place and circumstances of the alleged unlawful employment practice is to be served on the respondent within 10 days. If the Commission determines after investigation that there is not reasonable cause to believe the charge is true, it shall dismiss the charge and notify the parties. The Commission is required to accord substantial weight to the decision of the state or local authorities under state or local equal employment opportunity laws and to make the determination on reasonable cause as promptly as possible and so far as practicable not later than 120 days from the date the Commission was authorized to act on the charge. If the Commission determines that there is reasonable cause to believe the charge is true, it shall attempt conciliation in conformity with the requirements of existing law. Nothing said or done during conciliation may be disclosed without the consent of the parties.

The Senate amendment contained two provisions allowing the Commission to defer to state and local equal employment opportunity agencies. It deleted the language of existing law providing that no charge may be filed during the 60-day period allowed for the deferral and substituted a provision prohibiting the Commission from acting on such a charge until the expiration of the 60-day period. The House bill made no change in existing law. The Senate receded with an amendment that would re-state the existing law on the deferral of charges to state agencies. The conferees left existing law intact with the understanding that the decision in *Love's v. Pullman, U.S.* (February 17, 1972) interpreting the existing law to allow the Commission to receive a charge (but not act on it) during such deferral period is controlling.

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment provided that charges be filed within 180 days. The Senate allowed an additional 120 days if a charge is deferred to a state agency and the House allowed only 30 additional days. The Senate amendment required

that notice of the charge be served in 10 days. The House bill provided that charges under Title VII are the exclusive remedy for unlawful employment practices. The House receded.

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment authorized the bringing of civil actions in Federal district courts in cases involving unlawful employment practices.

The Senate amendment provided that the Attorney General bring actions against state and local governments. As to other respondents, suits were to be brought by the Commission. The Senate amendment permitted suits by the Commission or the Attorney General if the Commission was unable to secure from the respondent "a conciliation agreement acceptable to the Commission" while the House bill permitted the Commission to sue if it is unable to obtain "voluntary compliance." The Senate amendment permitted aggrieved persons to intervene in suits and allowed a private action if no case is brought by the Commission or Attorney General within 150 days. The House bill permitted a private action after 180 days. The Senate amendment allowed the General Counsel or Attorney General to intervene in private actions; the House bill permitted only the Attorney General to intervene. The Senate amendment permitted a private action in a case where the Commission entered into a conciliation agreement to which the aggrieved person was not a party (i.e. a signatory).

The conferees adopted a provision allowing the Commission, or the Attorney General in a case against a state or local government agency, to bring an action in Federal district courts if the Commission is unable to secure from the respondent "a conciliation agreement acceptable to the Commission." Aggrieved parties are permitted to intervene. They may bring a private action if the Commission or Attorney General has not brought suit within 180 days or the Commission has entered into a conciliation agreement to which such aggrieved party is not a signatory. The Commission, or the Attorney General in a case involving state and local governments, may intervene in such private action.

The Senate amendment provided for the appointment of a three judge district court in cases certified to be of general public importance, provided for the immediate designation of a single judge if no three judge court was requested, and required cases to be assigned for hearing at the earliest practicable date and to be expedited in every way. The House bill contained no such provision. The Senate receded with an amendment which provides that the chief judge of the district in which a case is filed designate the judge to hear the case which is to be assigned for hearing at the earliest practicable date and expedited in every way. The amendment deleted the provision for the three judge district court. Such a court is now provided for in "pattern or practice" cases.

The Senate amendment authorized the Commission or the Attorney General to seek preliminary injunctive relief. The House bill authorized the Commission to seek preliminary relief and required a showing that substantial and irreparable injury to the aggrieved party would be unavoidable. The Senate receded with an amendment that authorizes the Commission or the Attorney General to seek preliminary injunctive relief and a provision that Rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure should govern all actions brought under this subsection.

The Senate amendment restated existing law as to venue for civil actions except that the term "aggrieved person" was substituted for the word "plaintiff." The House bill left existing law intact. The House receded.

The House bill and the Senate amendment provided for the scope of relief that could be granted by the district courts. The differences were as follows:

1. The Senate amendment required a finding that the respondent engaged in an unlawful employment practice and the House bill required a finding that respondent "intentionally" engaged in such unlawful employment practice.

2. The Senate amendment added the phrase "or any other equitable relief that the court deems appropriate" to the description of the relief available from the court.

3. The Senate amendment limited back pay liability to that which accrues from a date not more than two years prior to the filing of a charge with the Commission; the House bill limited back pay liability to that which accrues not more than two years before the filing of a complaint with the court. Both the House bill and the Senate amendment provided that interim earnings shall operate to reduce the back pay otherwise allowable.

4. The House bill restated the provisions of existing law prohibiting court-ordered remedies based on any adverse action except unlawful employment practices prohibited under Title VII.

5. The House bill prohibited class action lawsuits.

The Senate receded with an amendment that provides the following:

1. A finding that the respondent has intentionally engaged or is intentionally engaging in an unlawful employment practice, as the language of the current law reads.

2. Authority for the court to enjoin the respondent from such practices, order such affirmative action as may be appropriate and any other equitable relief that the court deems appropriate.

3. The court is authorized to award back pay except that such back pay liability is limited to that which accrues from the date not more than two years prior to the filing of a charge with the Commission. Interim earnings shall operate to reduce the back pay otherwise allowable.

4. The provisions of existing law prohibiting court ordered remedies based on any adverse action except unlawful employment practices under Title VII are retained.

The Senate amendment permitted payment of costs and counsel fees to small employers or labor organizations if they prevailed in actions brought against them by the Commission or the United States. An employer or union with 25 or fewer employees or members would have been entitled to up to \$5000, and an employer or labor organization with from 25 to 100 employees or members whose average income from such employment was less than \$7500, would have been entitled to one-half the cost of its defense up to \$2500. The House bill had no comparable provisions. The Senate receded.

The Senate amendment authorized the courts to appoint a special master if the district court had not assigned a case for trial within 120 days after issue had been joined. There was no comparable House provision. The House receded.

The Senate amendment provided for a transfer of the Attorney General's "pattern or practice" jurisdiction to the Commission two years after enactment. In the interim period there would be concurrent jurisdiction. The transfer would be subject to change in accordance with a presidential reorganization plan if not vetoed by Congress. The House bill left pattern or practice jurisdiction with the Attorney General. The House receded.

The Senate amendment revised the Commission's procedures for cooperating with State and local agencies and in its record keeping requirements and provided procedures for compelling compliance with such requirements. The House bill did not amend the provisions of the current law. The House receded.

The Senate amendment simplified procedures for subpoenaing witnesses or records by providing the same investigative authority as is contained in the National Labor Relations Act. The House bill made no changes in existing authority. The House receded.

The Senate amendment provided for the appointment, with the advice and consent of the Senate, of up to four new commission members at any time after one year from the effective date of the act. The proportion of commissioners of one political party to another would remain the same. Regional Directors were to be appointed by the Chairman of the Commission with the concurrence of the General Counsel. The Senate amendment also placed a limit on the time that a Commissioner may serve after the appointment expires and the Senate has not acted. The House bill contained no such provisions. The Senate receded with an amendment limiting the time that a Commissioner may serve after the appointment expires and the Senate has not acted.

The Senate amendment established the office of General Counsel to be appointed by the President for a term of four years with the advice and consent of the Senate. The General Counsel was given the responsibility for filing complaints and the conduct of all litigation for the Commission. Also the General Counsel was given authority to appoint regional attorneys, with the concurrence of the Chairman, and other necessary employees. The House bill did not establish a General Counsel, and required that the Attorney General conduct all litigation to which the Commission is a party in the Supreme Court or in the United States Court of Appeals. All other litigation in which the Commission was a party was to be conducted by the Commission. The Senate receded with an amendment establishing the Office of General Counsel to be appointed by the President for a term of four years with the advice and consent of the Senate giving the General Counsel responsibility for litigation and concurrence with the Chairman in the appointment and supervision of regional attorneys but reserving to the Attorney General the conduct of all litigation to which the Commission is a party in the Supreme Court.

The Senate amendment permitted the Commission to accept uncompensated services for the limited purpose of publicizing in the media the Commission and its activities. The House bill did not provide such authority. The Senate receded.

The Senate amendment permitted the Commission to delegate certain functions, except for rulemaking and the power to make agreements with States. The House bill did not contain such a provision. The Senate receded.

The Senate amendment afforded additional protection to officers and employees of the Commission in the performance of their official duties by including them within section 1114 of Title 18, U.S.C. The House bill contained no such provision. The Senate receded with an amendment affording this new protection but excluding capital punishment for offenders.

The Senate amendment raised the level of the position of the Chairman and members of the Commission and established the position of General Counsel in the executive pay scale. The House bill made no provision for such change. The House receded.

The Senate amendment established an Equal Employment Opportunity Coordinating Council. The House bill had no such provision. The House receded.

The Committee of Conference believes that there are instances in which more than one agency may have legitimate interests in the employment standards applicable to a number of employees. So for example, the merit system standards of the Civil Service Com-

mission should be considered by the Coordinating Council in relation to their effect on the conciliation and enforcement efforts of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the Attorney General with respect to employees of governments, governmental agencies or political subdivisions.

The Senate amendment provided that all personnel actions involving Federal employees be free from discrimination. This policy was to be enforced by the United States Civil Service Commission. Each agency of the Federal Government would be responsible for establishing an internal grievance procedure and programs to train personnel so as to enable them to advance under the supervision of the Civil Service Commission. If final action had been taken by an agency or the Civil Service Commission, an aggrieved party could bring a civil action under the provisions of section 706. The House bill did not cover Federal employees. The House receded. In providing the statutory basis for such appeal or court access, it is not the intent of the Committee to subordinate any discretionary authority or final judgment now reposed in agency heads by, or under, statute for national security reasons in the interests of the United States.

The Senate amendment required consultation among the Executive branch agencies on Equal Employment matters. The House bill had no similar provision. The Senate receded in light of the action of the Conferees in establishing the Equal Employment Opportunity Coordinating Council.

The Senate amendment provided the Commission with authorization for an additional 10 positions at GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 level. The House bill had no such provision. The House receded.

The Senate amendment provided that the new enforcement provisions of section 706 apply to charges pending before the Commission on enactment. The House bill was silent. The House receded.

The Senate amendment provided that no Government contract, whether subject to Executive Order 11246 or any other equal employment opportunity law such as section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, as amended, could be terminated, denied, or withheld without a full hearing, where the employer had an affirmative action plan previously accepted within the past twelve months. The House bill had no such provision. The House receded.

CARL D. PERKINS,
JOHN H. DENT,
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,
PATSY T. MINK,
PHILLIP BURTON,
WM. L. (BILL) CLAY,
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS,
WILLIAM D. FORD,
MARIO BIAGGI,
ROMANO L. MAZZOLI,
ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,
JOHN BRADENAS,
ALBERT H. QUIG,
JOHN N. ERLÉNBOHN,
ALPHONZO BELL,
MARVIN L. ESCH,
EARL F. LANDGREBE,
ORVAL HANSEN,
WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
JACK KEMP,

Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
CLAIBORNE PELL,
GAYLORD NELSON,
THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
ADLAI E. STEVENSON,
HAROLD E. HUGHES,
JACOB K. JAVITS,
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,
BOB PACKWOOD,
ROBERT TAFT, JR.,
ROBERT T. STAFFORD,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CONSUMERS NEED PROTECTION FROM DIRTY MEAT—NOT MORE OF IT

(Mr. MELCHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, in my household we have stopped the use of any meat except American-produced domestic meat which we can examine, as cuts, before they are cooked and consumed.

My wife does not put on our breakfast, dinner, or supper tables any prepared meats, hamburger, meat soups, or other products which may contain imported meat.

As a veterinarian, I have no confidence that many kinds of imported meat can be trusted to be wholesome, healthful and fit for human consumption.

I know that in 1970 we admitted 11 million pounds of meat into the United States from just seven Australian plants which were found unfit to ship to the United States after the determination of unfitness had been made. I know there were hundreds more foreign plants found to be dirty and not fit to export to us but that many times the 11 million pounds were admitted from such substandard plants abroad before they were delisted, or cleaned up, because our review officers inspect only about once a year. Our review staff is inadequate to get around more often than that.

The practice in my home of using American meat only is going to continue until this country cleans up imported meats by establishing an imported meat inspection system which provides consumer protection instead of a sort of diplomatic immunity from strictly enforced U.S. inspection requirements. That inspection is going to have to include testing for chemical residues which might be injurious to health. Our State Department is shielding the exporting countries from a requirement to set standards equal to ours concerning the use of pesticides and other chemicals that are hazards to human health.

The House Agriculture Committee knuckled under to overwhelming administration pressure from State and Agriculture Departments to delete from a bill equal standards for domestic and foreign food producers in the use of chemicals which leave residues injurious to the health of consumers. The miniscule residue sampling we do on foreign meat imports shows alarming increase of chlorinated hydrocarbon residues such as DDT and benzene hexachloride which are banned in this country for us on livestock.

It is quite shocking to me, Mr. Speaker, that this country is considering increasing meat import allowances to roll back the price of our domestic product, instead of talking with exporting countries about the cleanliness and healthfulness of what we are already getting.

The Comptroller General of the United States has recently supplied this Congress with a report on inspection of foreign packing plants and meat imports—both fresh, chilled, cooked, and canned—that should cause Members to

demand suspension of all imports until their wholesomeness and healthfulness can be guaranteed, and we can be assured every pound of it was produced in plants that meet American inspection standards under the eyes of reliable inspectors, and not a corps of people overawed by diplomatic niceties. The report to me is like a rerun of a bad dream because I cited to the House early in 1970 the glaring shortcomings of inspection of foreign meats.

Let me call the House's attention to the sort of thing that is going on in the meatpacking plants that ship to the United States, and what our inspectors, who visit those plants about once a year, and doing about it, as reported by the General Accounting Office.

The GAO sent investigators along with our foreign review officers on visits to 80 plants in four countries that export to the United States.

In Australia, the source of 505 million pounds of imported beef and veal and 25 million pounds of mutton in 1971, they visited 35 plants—10 of them or nearly 30 percent so bad that they had to be delisted and denied the right to ship to the United States, but the meat they had already shipped us was not intercepted. Until the delisting was officially cleared in Washington and transmitted to the foreign government some 6 weeks later the plants continued to unload their unfit meat on us. One other plant was found not in compliance with our U.S. sanitation and health requirements, but not so bad that it was delisted. You can judge what the conditions must have been in the "delisted" plants by the description of the one allowed to continue in operation.

The GAO tells us:

The (U.S.) Consumer and Marketing Service foreign programs officer reported that the (Australian) inspectors at this plant—

Did not require that grossly contaminated carcasses be trimmed before going to the coolers or boning rooms.

Did not require that carcasses be dressed in a sanitary manner.

In performing examinations on beef heads, passed heads even though there were big balls of ingesta in the mouths.

Failed to detect a diseased head which should have been condemned and should have served as the basis for a more complete inspection of the carcass. When the foreign programs officer pointed out the condition to the Australian inspection officials, the carcass was inspected further and the carcass and parts were condemned.

The foreign programs officer reported also that the preoperative sanitation inspection of the plant showed that almost all equipment looked at was dirty and that the filth on some equipment was obviously of many days duration. He stated that the Australian inspector inspected some of the same equipment but took no action to have the equipment cleaned before operations started. The foreign programs officer reported further that he found slaughtering operations in process about 1 hour after the preoperative inspection, that he rechecked some of the equipment and found it to be still dirty and that the Australian inspector permitted the slaughtering operations to continue.

Despite the above-cited deficiencies, and the fact that no action was taken at the time of the review, C&MS gave Australian inspection officials the option of correcting the deficiencies or delisting the plants. C&MS officials told us they did not require

the plant to be delisted because the deficiencies pertained mainly to improper inspection by Australian inspectors and could be readily corrected.

A C&MS foreign programs officer's review of the plant about 2½ months later, in July, 1970, showed that deficiencies still existed. The plant was delisted at that time, and as of November, 1972 it had not been recertified for exporting to the United States. Until it was delisted, the plant remained eligible to export meat products to the United States even though it was not in compliance with U.S. requirements.

C&MS records relating to plants in Australia showed that C&MS had not always required inspection officials to correct promptly certain deficiencies in the Australian inspection system or in approved plants.

This episode, which means that American consumers ate dirty and possibly unhealthy meat from a dirty packing plant in Australia for months after our people knew about it, in addition to 10 plants they did not know about for months prior to inspection, is only one of scores of known and unknown cases of this kind, and it is only one of a series of instances of official negligence, resulting in dirty and unwholesome meat reaching our consumers, which reach right here into this House of Representatives.

This House of Representatives has had the laxity of meat inspection called to its attention in the past. I have a bill before it, passed once by the Senate, to require piece-by-piece inspection of meat after it reaches our shores, but it has not been passed, although the evidence piles up that the meat products we are getting from abroad include up to 30 percent from plants which do not meet our inspection standards.

If the filth and carelessness in the Australian plant, which was not delisted, was mainly the result of lax inspection, why did not our inspectors crack down on the Australian inspection system, which our law says must be equivalent to ours? Why was no action taken against the Australian inspector who allowed the practices described? Why did we not notify the Australian Government to get its inspection in compliance with our requirement at once?

And when the Congress of the United States knows that this sort of lax inspection of foreign plants is going on, why do we not crack down on the whole business and take the steps necessary to stop it?

We can get out and pass the bill within days to require piece by piece examination of imported meat after it reaches the United States. The Department of Agriculture has opposed it, both at Senate hearings, and at House hearings.

The Senate proceeded to pass the bill, nonetheless.

The House did not act on it, and it died. Some of my colleagues felt that the introduction of the bill, the hearings and the attention given the subject then would cause necessary reform exporting; that action which might offend the governments of the countries exporting dirty meat was unnecessary, and it might cause retaliation against U.S. products.

As one industry apologist put it: "Yes, we have to eat their dirty meat so they will eat our dirty stuff."

In order to frighten me, he mentioned rat droppings in wheat.

In other words, our consumers must eat filthy products so that handlers, processors, and exploiters both here or abroad would not be required to live up to strict standards.

If the United States is allowing products to be exported from our shores that are dirty, or substandard, we should stop it immediately.

And if the standards we have set to reassure our consumers that the food products they are buying and eating are clean, wholesome, and healthful are being ignored abroad, we should crack down without fear, favor, or any further tolerance of officials who seem to think that a little ingesta, a little manure, a few cysts and lesions, a quantity of dirt and trash, and some blood clots, hair, and bones ought to be tolerated, and that JOHN MELCHER and Senator ABE RIBICOFF who has repeatedly protested in the Senate ought to keep their mouths shut.

Much of this traffic in dirty foreign meat is frozen boneless beef which many consumer groups believe to be sold here at greatly reduced prices to cut the average housewife's grocery bill. Not so. The Provisioner's February 10, 1972, quotation for American produced and graded boneless beef was 69¼ cents as compared to imported bull meat at 66 cents a pound and imported cow meat at 63½ cents a pound, none of which is graded and less than 1 percent of which is actually U.S. inspected.

I have been told that I should be not only content but proud of the reform that my efforts to reform imported meat inspection have brought about. Three or four additional foreign review officers have been employed. Several have been stationed abroad to reduce the 22 weeks a year they were spending traveling and in the United States while all were stationed here. All Australian mutton plants were delisted, and they are being certified to export to us on an individual basis. Inspection facilities at our docks are being cleaned up a little.

But the foreign meat continues to pour in, with less than 1 percent actually examined by our inspectors at the docks here, from foreign plants that are seen by our inspectors on an average only about every 10 months—and from plants that are found out of compliance with U.S. standards even after that finding.

The current report from the General Accounting Office is only one of a series on meat and poultry inspection about which the Congress has done little or nothing.

In September 1969, the GAO reported that the Consumer and Marketing Service needed to strengthen inspection at federally inspected poultry plants. In June 1970, the GAO reported need to strengthen enforcement procedures at domestic meat plants. In November 1971, the GAO gave us a second report on poultry plants and told us it continued to be weak, including startling information about unsanitary conditions and laxity in enforcement against at least one of the "big shots" in the broiler business.

We have only noted these reports here in Congress.

This most current report, dated February 18, 1972, concerns the first General Accounting Office examination into the adequacy and effectiveness of Consumer and Marketing Service inspection of meat imported into the United States from plants abroad and, although the GAO reports that products are being shipped into our country from plants that have been delisted "for conditions that could render the products unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, and otherwise unfit as human food"—and I have quoted the GAO verbatim—it appears right now as if our Government's only reaction is going to be another suspension of the import quota law to let another 100 million pounds in on our consumers.

The current report is based on visits made to 80 plants in four foreign countries—Australia, Argentina, Canada, and Denmark—by GAO investigators accompanying Consumer and Marketing Administration foreign program officers.

I am personally disappointed that the GAO did not get to more countries; it seems to me they visited four where packing procedures should be highly sophisticated compared to some of the others. We get a good deal of meat from Haiti, Panama, Costa Rica, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Guatemala, the Dominican Republic, Poland, Yugoslavia, New Zealand, Ireland, Brazil, and other countries.

Our laws require that inspection in every exporting country be equal to inspection in the United States. Our Department of Agriculture examines the basic inspection laws and the inspection systems in countries which want to export to us, and if they find that the national criteria and design for inspection meets our standards, the country is approved and provides us with a list of plants qualified to export to us, and they can start shipping.

Our own foreign program officers then schedule visits to the plants. They get around to them about once a year on the average although some of the larger exporters are checked two, three, and occasionally four times a year.

Our foreign review officers, who are veterinarians, are authorized to withdraw the certification of plants when they feel justified because of lack of sanitation, proper procedures, proper inspection, or other situations which might result in unsound, unsanitary, unhealthful, or otherwise unfit meat reaching the United States. This withdrawal can lead to delisting, which stops further export to us.

Although a foreign meat plan may be delisted, its meat products produced prior to its delisting are eligible for importation unless Consumer and Marketing Service has determined and notified its inspectors at ports of entry that the deficiencies causing the plant's delisting create a health hazard.

At the beginning of 1971 Consumer and Marketing Service had approved the inspection systems of 42 countries and all but five of these countries had meat plants certified to export to the United States. On October 31, 1971, 36 countries

had a total of 967 meat plants certified to export to the United States.

During the year 1970, 327 foreign meat plants were delisted. Of those, 68 were recertified during the year. During the first 10 months of 1971, 139 plants were delisted, and of those 15 were later recertified. At the beginning of 1972 there were 948 certified foreign meat plants.

As of May 18, 1971, 60 Consumer and Marketing Service inspectors in this country were assigned full time to inspecting foreign meat imports and 88 meat inspectors were assigned on a part-time basis to inspecting foreign meat at various points in the United States. During fiscal year 1971, 1.7 billion pounds of foreign meat products were accepted and 1.5 percent of the total quantity of meat products imported or 25.2 million pounds were rejected. This is a very small amount considering the number of plants delisted.

Foreign program officers visit the nearly 1,000 certified plants about once a year. Consumer and Marketing Service does not require mandatory delistments of plants that fail to meet U.S. sanitation requirements. It permits some plants failing to meet U.S. requirements to remain eligible to export meat and meat products to the United States on a promise to "shape up." Deficiencies reported for these plants by the foreign program officers include a variety of unsanitary conditions, inadequate antemortem and postmortem inspections, contamination of products during processing, and inadequate control over contaminated carcasses or products.

Consumer and Marketing Service permits plants that have been delisted to export meat products to the United States processed prior to the date of delisting unless the plants have been declared health hazards. During 1970 an average of 45 days elapsed between the time a Consumer and Marketing Service foreign program officer found a meat plant not in compliance with the U.S. requirements and the date of its delisting. Even then, meat shipped prior to delisting was allowed to come into the United States.

During 1970 an average of 10 months elapsed between a foreign program officer's review of a plant that showed it met U.S. requirements and the review that resulted in its delisting. Thus some plants probably operated under conditions requiring delistments for extended periods.

The Government Accounting Office has recommended to us, as a result of its review, that the following steps should be taken:

First. Require the delisting of foreign meat plants that do not meet basic U.S. requirements;

Second. Eliminate the time lapse between the date a plant is found to be objectionable and the date of its delisting;

Third. Prohibit importation of any meat products produced by a delisted plant effective on the date of its delisting because of the conditions found which might cause it to be unwholesome, unhealthful, or otherwise unfit as human food; and

Fourth. Increase the frequency of inspections of foreign plants by foreign review officers to insure compliance with U.S. requirements.

By countries inspected by Government Accounting Office, the following results were found:

Of 35 Australian plants reviewed, 10 were delisted. An additional plant did not comply with many U.S. requirements. Australian inspection officials promised to have the deficiencies in this particular plant corrected, and it was allowed to continue to operate. I have already discussed the flagrant violations of standards involved in that case.

Despite reports from its foreign review officers to Consumer and Marketing Service that some Australian plants did not require their inspectors to maintain full control over condemned products until the products were destroyed as unfit for human purposes, and despite the warning by its foreign program officers that the postmortem inspection in many Australian plants was not effective in preventing inclusion in food for human consumption, mutton, which under our requirements should have been condemned, Consumer and Marketing Service did not follow through with delisting of these plants for many months. Finally, in May of 1970, Consumer and Marketing imposed an embargo on the importation of all mutton produced in Australia. Consumer and Marketing Service has busied itself since recertifying the mutton plants in Australia on a plant by plant basis as they correct their deficiencies.

ARGENTINA

Ten Argentine plants were reviewed. We got 88 million pounds of beef from the country in 1971. Only cooked meat either wrapped or canned is allowed to be imported from countries where there is hoof and mouth disease such as Argentina. None of the 10 plants reviewed was delisted although nine of them showed some deficiencies and were cited as follows:

Argentine inspectors were not giving sufficient emphasis to product cleanliness at time of slaughter and to carcass reinspection prior to boning.

Argentine inspectors were not exerting effective control to eliminate steam on kill floors and condensation in coolers and were not always sufficiently aggressive in seizing unclean products and suspending operation of unsanitary equipment and departments.

While Argentine inspectors at one of these 10 plants condemned large numbers of organs because of tuberculosis, few carcasses of the animals with diseased organs were condemned. The meat of tubercular animals was thus being processed.

One of the Argentine plants made it a common practice to slaughter animals on weekends when there were no inspectors present. This practice supposedly ceased when a foreign review officer complained.

CANADA

Eighteen plants were inspected in this country, which sent us 80 million pounds of beef and 69 million pounds of pork in 1971. Canadian inspection officials suspended operations of 11 of them for varying periods of time and four plants were

delisted because of unsanitary conditions or product contamination.

The records showed that in some cases our inspection service permitted plants to remain on the list of plants certified to export products to the United States even though the plants were not in compliance with U.S. requirements and previously reported deficiencies had not been corrected as promised by Canadian inspection officials.

GAO cited an example in detail where a foreign program officer reported that his March 1970 review of the plant showed deficiencies. The chronology of events following this was:

April 1970 Consumer and Marketing Service requested Canadian inspection officials to have the plant immediately correct the deficiencies.

June 1970 Canadian officials told Consumer and Marketing Service that they were giving the plant special attention.

July 1970 Consumer and Marketing Service again requested Canadian officials to correct the deficiencies.

October 1970 Consumer and Marketing Service foreign programs officer in review of the plant reported that sanitation of the plant had been improved but that sanitary handling of products and the conditions of some of the facilities and equipment was still not satisfactory.

He recommended that the plant be delisted. Consumer and Marketing Service then advised Canadian inspection officials that the remedial measures taken at the plant were not adequate and requested that the plant be delisted. Canadian inspection officials were not prepared to delist the plant because some improvement had been made and that further improvements would be made.

December 1970 a Consumer and Marketing Service foreign programs officer again reviewed the plant and noted further improvements but stated that more were still needed. The GAO said:

Although the plant eventually made most of the improvements, C&MS requests for correction of deficiencies or delistment of the plant were not implemented for a ten month period during which the plant was permitted to export meat products into the U.S.

DENMARK

Seventeen Danish plants were reviewed. Some plants met most of the U.S. requirements, but others failed to meet certain basic requirements. None was delisted.

An analysis of the deficiencies noted in these plants indicated that Danish inspection needed to be improved to strengthen its enforcement capability and to provide more training for inspectors in the area of sanitation and sanitary control.

Denmark exported over 128,000,000 pounds of pork and pork products to the United States in 1971, mostly cooked and canned.

Records showed that in July 1969 a Consumer and Marketing Service inspector reported that at approved plants in Denmark carcasses were being contaminated with a mixture of water and fecal matter during slaughtering. He recommended that restrictions be placed on the use of certain parts of the carcass in the production of luncheon meats

for export to the United States, but Consumer and Marketing Service did not follow through.

There had been complaint, GAO reports, that Danish inspectors do not exercise full control over condemned products—a basic requirement of U.S. inspection—to assure they are not used in human food. Despite the complaints, no plants were delisted. As late as the inspections in which GAO was present, the foreign review officer complained that while controls had improved at some plants, at others the Danish inspectors still did not exercise adequate control over inedible and condemned products.

TIME LAGS IN DELISTMENTS

The General Accounting Office found that it takes weeks between a foreign review officer's inspection of a foreign plant and its final delistment, averaging 45 days in 1970.

It adds:

Meat products processed in the plants in the interim are eligible to export to the United States . . .

Unless a plant is classified as a health hazard, and there have been only two so classified in 1968 and two in 1970, the recommendation for delistment must clear the Department of Agriculture Foreign Agricultural Service and the State Department before the request for delistment can be transmitted to the foreign country. Meantime, its meat is eligible to be sent to the United States.

The General Accounting Office comments:

Unless a plant is delisted as a health hazard, C&MS permits meat products certified by foreign officials as being produced prior to the effective date of a plant's delistment to be presented for entry and, if they pass inspection at the ports of entry, to be imported into the United States. Because the conditions at a plant causing its delistment generally have been identified several weeks earlier and may have existed for some time before being identified, we believe that the continued importation of products produced prior to delistment from plants delisted for conditions that could render the products unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or otherwise unfit as human food is not in the best interest of U.S. consumers.

In explanation of this, the GAO says:

The deficiencies cited by C&MS in its requests for delistment of the nine plants delisted during May and the number of plants in which the deficiencies existed follow.

(1) Unacceptable sanitation as evidenced by unclean floors, chutes, overhead structures, and equipment; excessive condensation; flaking paint; rusty pipes, broken plumbing; ineffective insect control; poor housekeeping in general; and the lack of a comprehensive sanitation inspection program, including an effective daily preoperative sanitation inspection—eight plants.

Facilities and equipment not in compliance with U.S. requirements as evidenced by unscreened building openings; insufficient or inoperative sterilizers and lavatories; facilities and equipment incapable of being cleaned; congested operating areas; and broken driveways, walls drains and floors—five plants.

(3) Inspectors passing carcasses which would be condemned in the United States—four plants.

(4) Inspectors permitting heavily contaminated carcasses in coolers—nine plants.

(An additional plant, making a total of 10 were delisted after our foreign review officers cited serious deficiencies and went through the delisting procedures.)

About 11 million pounds of meat products produced by seven of the ten delisted plants were imported into the United States after the C&MS foreign programs officer had made the plant review.

Because of the length of time between foreign programs officers' reviews of foreign meat plants or the time that elapses between January 1 of each year when most plants are automatically recertified and the dates of their subsequent reviews, some plants probably have operated for extended periods under conditions which did not meet U.S. requirements.

INFREQUENT INSPECTIONS

In a section on infrequency of inspection, the GAO tells us:

To more adequately safeguard U.S. consumers, C&MS needs to increase the frequency of its foreign programs officers' reviews of plants to detect unacceptable plants more promptly and thus reduce the potential for importing products into the United States that are not produced in accordance with U.S. requirements.

C&MS records on the 327 plants delisted during calendar year 1970 . . . show that many of the plants may have operated under unsatisfactory conditions for long periods of time. (A table of time which elapsed between a C&MS review which showed plants operating in accordance with requirements and the date of subsequent review when plant was found not operating in accordance with requirements varied up to 25 months and averaged over seven months.)

RECOMMENDATIONS

To ensure that only meat and meat products produced in plants meeting U.S. requirements are permitted entry into the United States for domestic consumption, C&MS should:

Authorize its foreign programs officers to provisionally delist those plants that do not meet basic U.S. requirements until corrections are made;

Prohibit the importation from delisted plants of all meat products produced prior to the date of the plant's delistment when the conditions causing delistment are such that prior products may have been rendered if injurious to health or, for any reason, may be unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or otherwise unfit as human food;

Station additional foreign programs officers in those foreign countries where necessary to meet plant-review frequency objectives.

Further comments of the GAO report include the following:

The Department agreed that C&MS had been too lenient with the inspection systems of some foreign countries in the past and that C&MS should be more aggressive in insisting upon the immediate correction of defects.

The Department stated that our proposal made in a draft of this report that meat products produced by a plant prior to the date of its delistment be prohibited from entering the U.S. was the practice followed with plants classified as health hazards but that such a policy should not be instituted for delistments irrespective of cause. The Department stated that this would go far beyond C&MS' rules for domestic plants and would be grossly unfair if delistment were required for reasons either unrelated or only indirectly related to wholesomeness.

On the other hand, we believe that prohibiting the entry of products only from plants classified by C&MS as health hazards may not be fair to U.S. consumers or to competing plants, both domestic and foreign. C&MS records showed that, of the 1,545 plants

delisted during calendar years 1968 through 1971, only four were officially classified as health hazards, two in 1968 and two in 1970.

On the basis of our review of C&MS records of plants delisted in 1970, which showed apparently serious deficiencies in some plants not classified as health hazards, we believe that the Department may need to broaden its criteria for determining when products from delisted plants, produced prior to delisting, should be prohibited from entering the United States. Under these broadened criteria we believe that such determinations should be made by the foreign programs officers at the time they provisionally delist plants.

CANNED AND PACKAGED MEATS

To ensure that all imported meat and meat products are suitable for domestic consumption, C&MS needs to (1) improve its program for inspecting processed canned and packaged meat products presented for import at ports of entry or other destination points, (2) ensure greater uniformity in the application of inspection procedures, and (3) develop an effective program for training import inspectors.

In a review at 12 ports of entry a C&MS team reported deficiencies in inspection activities. The team reported that, in general, a variance existed among locations in following C&MS-established procedures and practices for inspecting imported manufacturing meats. The team reported that (1) prescribed inspection procedures were not always followed, (2) inspection facilities generally were not equipped properly for effective inspections, and (3) some inspectors misunderstood the inspection standards.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one point in concluding these remarks and this report to the House.

We are dealing here with the quality of products allowed to enter this country and to be sold to American consumers—not with quantity.

There is a divergence of opinion on whether we should let more imported meat into the United States to put a lid on meat prices, or tighten up quantity restrictions some by imposing quarterly quotas, and separate quotas on beef, mutton, and lamb. I think we need a more explicit quota law, and one the President cannot suspend year after year.

But certainly there can be no disagreement that we should be completely certain that every pound of meat that enters this country to go to consumers under a "U.S. Inspected and Passed" label is clean, wholesome, healthful, and fit for human food.

That is not the case today, and this is no time to think about letting more questionable products into this country.

It is a time to think about restricting the flow of imports to products which can be marketed under the "U.S. Inspected and Passed" label with complete confidence, and doing that promptly.

MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE ENDORSED BY DEMOCRATIC STEERING COMMITTEE

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday afternoon the Democratic Steering Committee met and unanimously passed the following resolution:

Whereas it has been six years since Congress acted to increase the minimum wage

or broaden its coverage, and whereas the cost of living has increased 16 percent since the Nixon Administration took office, and whereas the present minimum wage results in family income below the poverty line, and whereas raising the minimum wage and broadening its coverage will, by increasing consumer purchasing power, bolster the national economy without promoting inflation, be it resolved by the Democratic Steering Committee that all Democratic Members of the House are urged to support and vote for H.R. 7130, The Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1971.

The above Resolution adopted unanimously by House Democratic Steering Committee yesterday.

CHAIRMAN

Ray J. Madden, Indiana.

SECRETARY

Spark M. Matsunaga, Hawaii.

EX OFFICIO

Carl Albert, Oklahoma.

Hale Boggs, Louisiana.

Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Massachusetts.

Olin E. Teague, Texas.

Leonor K. Sullivan, Missouri.

John Brademas, Indiana.

John J. McFall, California.

ZONE MEMBERS

John S. Monagan, Connecticut.

Bertram L. Podell, New York.

John H. Dent, Pennsylvania.

Peter W. Rodino, Jr., New Jersey.

Watkins M. Abbitt, Virginia.

W. J. Bryan Dorn, South Carolina.

Joseph E. Karth, Minneapolis.

Ray J. Madden, Indiana.

Thomas L. Ashley, Ohio.

Bill Alexander, Arkansas.

Joe D. Waggoner, Jr., Louisiana.

Paul G. Rogers, Florida.

Neal Smith, Iowa.

Melvin Price, Illinois.

Wright Patman, Texas.

Spark M. Matsunaga, Hawaii.

Teno Roncallo, Wyoming.

Julia Butler Hansen, Washington.

Chet Holifield, California.

MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE A MUST IN THIS SESSION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. Speaker, the House Democratic Steering Committee meeting yesterday afternoon unanimously approved a resolution urging immediate action on H.R. 7130, a bill calling for an increase in minimum wage to \$2 per hour in some business categories and a more moderate increase on certain farm labor operations. Over the last 3 years the cost of living has gone up on the average of approximately 16 percent. The minimum wage increase legislation has practically remained dormant during this long period of time and the Congress and the administration have completely ignored the frantic economic condition of millions of wage earners throughout the land.

Every time we have tried to increase the minimum wage rate to barely relate to the economic realities of the moment, we hear the antiquated predictions of the widespread unemployment and inflation it will create.

May I remind my business-oriented friends on the other side that in this fourth, and hopefully final, year of the Nixon economic caper, we have already been adequately visited by unemployment and inflation; and to a greater extent than I care to recall. The chief vic-

tims of this economic catastrophe have been the lowest paid of our working people. They are not the contributors, as my Republican friends suggest; indeed they are carrying its greatest burden.

Our country learned a lesson back in the 1920's when the Government neglected the wage and salary earners of America and unemployment became rampant because of low wages and lack of buying power. This led to the closing of factories, businesses, and the devastating depression of the early 1930's.

The Congress, under Franklin D. Roosevelt, initiated a great program to restore employment, increase wages, and buying power. Prosperity was eventually restored and remained up until the Eisenhower-Nixon administrations under the leadership of that great industrialist, George M. Humphrey of Ohio, as Secretary of the Treasury. He immediately restored high interest rates, increased profits, and conglomerates and the economy suffered three depressions in 8 years.

In January 1969, at the beginning of this administration the same economic blue-print was reinstated under the Nixon administration that brought us economic reverses and a depression.

Unemployment and lack of buying power exists over the Nation today by reason of low wages and millions of salaried and wage earners and continued rising prices which brings exorbitant profits and the old Republican trickle-down theory is rampant today in our national industrial and rural economy.

This minimum wage bill which was reported out of the House Education and Labor Committee months ago still languishes in the Rules Committee for action. The bill would enable a nonfarm minimum wage worker to earn approximately \$4,160 in 1973 by working full time for each of the 52 weeks in the year.

Mr. Speaker, that figure does not even attain the minimum poverty standard for a family of four now, in March of 1972, and the annual income for an agricultural minimum wage earner would be significantly less. Is it repugnant to some of our colleagues that a full-time worker should fall short of providing the most basic of life's necessities for his family?

Now Mr. Speaker, who are the people that this bill affects the most? They are the working poor. They are proud people who want to work and are willing to work if given the opportunity. I ask you how equitable is it when people are willing to go out and work for the minimum wage rate while others can look forward to receiving more by working less.

Now, about inflation. We have all been told that increasing the minimum wage causes inflation. There is no foundation to this argument. Even the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which is not exactly renowned for its compassion for social legislation, has given up on this argument. It has proved so foundless.

Apparently, however, some of their elected representatives here have yet to get the message. Even the Nixon-appointed Pay Board has concluded that wage increases below \$2.20 an hour should be exempt from its consideration because such wages could not conceivably

have an inflationary impact. This is not an inflationary piece of legislation.

It is not insignificant that today's minimum wage of \$1.60 buys less than the \$1.25 minimum wage bought in 1966; or that if a cost-of-living increase mechanism had been incorporated into the 1966 amendments, today's minimum wage rate would exceed the proposed \$2 an hour figure.

With respect to creating unemployment, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that the Department of Labor has a mandate to relate minimum wage increases and unemployment. The Department has not, since 1938, ever been able to associate the two as a cause-effect relationship. In fact, the following excerpt from the Department's 1971 report not only supports this fact but begs for the immediate passage of H.R. 7130:

The relationship between the minimum wage and average hourly earnings or average hourly compensation varies, depending upon whether account is taken of changes in coverage. Although the minimum wage has been increased substantially, its ratio to earnings has been largely eroded by gains in average hourly earnings between the periods of increases in the minimum wage. Consequently, the ratio of the minimum wage to average hourly earnings or to average hourly compensation per man hour is now lower than it was in 1950, when the 1949 amendments went into effect.

So much for unemployment and inflation.

Mr. Speaker, there are obviously no rational reasons for opposing this \$2 per hour minimum wage legislation. This bill is moderate in every respect. The Education and Labor Committee was endless in its pursuit of legislation that would meet all legitimate concerns, without sacrificing the integrity of those it sought to assist. They accomplished that delicate resolution, but we continue to find ourselves in a quagmire of immobility caused by those whose uncompromising and unconscionable attitude toward their fellow man will never change.

Mr. Speaker, the extent to which we further delay consideration of this vital wage legislation is the extent to which the economic disparity between the haves and have-nots becomes enlarged.

This is not the time to submit to that stagnant, archaic Republican philosophy of human timidity and trickle-down economy. The consequences are too great and too heartrending. We, as Democrats, must join with those of our more reasoned Republican friends to insure at least a modicum standard of living for our working poor. To do less would be to abrogate the trust and tradition which has been passed on to the Congress.

I hope this moderate increase in minimum wages is enacted into law without further delay.

PRESIDENT'S CHINA TRIP

(Mr. DEVINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, there has been a big rush to pronounce judgment on the results of President Nixon's China trip. Much of it is erroneous rhetoric, and

meaningless carping. Some of the critics have fallen into the trap of making emotional "profound" pronouncements without bothering to read or study the joint communique. In fact, jumping to conclusions they apparently wanted to reach without supporting facts or evidence certainly will be embarrassing to many at a later date, yet do a disservice to the President and the country in the meantime.

It is just too bad this is an election year with a whole stable full of presidential candidates stumbling over themselves seeking headlines and attention, hopeful for political advantages.

First, let us put things in proper perspective:

First. The communism of Red China is considerably different than the communism of the Soviet Union, which is in its third and fourth generations of oppressive bureaucracy. The oriental mind is considerably different and the Chinese have a real ideological fervor amounting to a reincarnation of imperialism, or a different brand of fanaticism.

Second. When the President arrived in Peking on February 23, no Chinese had ever even seen a picture of President Nixon or photographs of any of the Chinese officials with any of our officials, and it was indeed a great breakthrough when the controlled press of China suddenly bloomed forth with all the photographs and coverage the following day.

Third. Relative to the communique, it is necessary to try to understand oriental thinking. The Chinese statements in the communique were soft by their standards, although considered tough by American standards. The communique was published and broadcast in all radios and publications in China.

Fourth. Relative to Taiwan, we affirmed our treaty commitment to them—in Shanghai on February 27. We reaffirmed our interest in a peaceful solution to the Taiwan situation, and agreed to reduce forces as the tensions diminish, which includes the whole western Pacific. There are 8,200 American forces in Taiwan, 6,500 of which are Southeast Asia related and mostly Air Force. They were not there prior to the Vietnamese situation, and certainly will not be necessary when that is resolved. Of the remaining 1,700, all except 200 are communications and intelligent related. We have no present plan to reduce our forces.

Fifth. Last year ping-pong was considered front page news. Now the two Nations have agreed to foster exchanges, expand trade, and create a formal point of diplomatic contact. This is of great significance after a 20-some-year wall of silence, particularly since there was an agreement to settle disputes without the use of force.

Sixth. No foreign aid from United States to China was asked, nor even considered. The Chinese are compulsively self-sufficient, and no such assistance is even anticipated.

Seventh. The President has assured the American people that there are no secret deals of any kind, and we are not giving up any of our commitments to any country and our general policy over the years has been to withdraw troops as tensions reduce, not only here, but "overseas."

It is hoped not only all of the presidential candidates, on both tickets, but others, in and out of government, including the media, will act responsibly and not make more wild, reckless, unfounded statements about the China trip. Sensationalism and political expediency have no place in this historic breakthrough in foreign relations. They should welcome this clear demonstration of the success of the Nixon doctrine in practice.

MEMORIAL DAY AND VETERANS DAY

(Mr. QUILLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, I introduced H.R. 13455 to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to the observance of Memorial Day and Veterans Day. Several Members joined me in cosponsoring this measure to change the law in order to celebrate Veterans Day on November 11 and Memorial Day on May 30.

In retrospect our diminution of the tradition and sanctity of both Memorial Day and Veterans Day, commemorative dates existing for one century and half a century respectively, is something foreign to our American heritage. In sacrificing dates held dear by so many for merely the self-indulgence of additional long weekends indicates we may have momentarily heard a different drummer than the one that made our Nation great and strong.

Memorial Day was originally established by Gen. John A. Logan, Commander, Grand Army of the Republic, on May 30, 1868, to honor the dead servicemen of the Civil War. Subsequently, May 30 has been observed to commemorate those who made the supreme sacrifice in all wars.

Veterans Day, originally Armistice Day, commemorated the end of World War I on November 11, 1918. At that time President Wilson urged our Nation to observe with solemn pride and gratitude this date.

The Congress of the United States requested the President to proclaim national observance of Armistice Day in 1926 and in 1938, November 11 was made a national holiday. Congress changed the designation of November 11 to Veterans Day in 1954 to commemorate the ensuing peace and freedom preserved by our several wars.

In 1968 the Congress passed the Monday Holiday Act which has been observed this past year for the first time and arbitrarily vested more meaning in 3-day weekends than the history, tradition and sanctity of these special days.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress in its wisdom has often seen fit to amend legislation the test of time has proven inadequate or inappropriate for the intended purpose. My constituency desires passage of the legislation I have introduced, and so do the veterans organizations. In particular, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States whose 1,800,000 members are all combat veterans adopted a resolution at its national convention last

August in support of changing these dates.

Therefore, it is my sincere hope the Judiciary Committee will take timely action on my bill in the near future and return Veterans Day and Memorial Day to their proper dates.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT— MINIMUM WAGE

(Mr. DENT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the Fair Labor Standards Act, more than any other piece of social legislation, is in desperate need of updating. Its benefits and protections, absolutely essential to millions of America's working poor, have been seriously eroded by the economic policies of the administration.

The buying power of the \$1.60 minimum wage adopted in 1966 has been all but destroyed. Since that time, living costs have risen more than 25 percent.

The minimum wage, which was an acceptable floor in 1966, no longer even approaches the federally defined poverty level for a family of four.

There must be immediate, affirmative congressional action to keep American families from being destroyed.

The House congressional hearings, which demonstrated the truth of these contentions, produced H.R. 7130. The Senate committee has not completed executive action on its bill—S. 1861. We urge the Senate to promptly report a bill.

The House Rules Committee is stalling on reporting H.R. 7130. We commend the Speaker of the House for his effort to get the bill reported and urge the Rules Committee to act immediately.

The House bill would immediately raise the minimum wage for most covered employees to \$2 and would extend coverage to about 5 million more workers. Its immediate adoption would be a valuable forward step.

However, as the Ninth Constitutional Convention of the AFL-CIO stated, labor's goals for the Fair Labor Standards Act continue to be:

A minimum wage of at least \$2.50 an hour.

Full minimum wage and maximum hours coverage for all workers engaged in interstate commerce, the production of goods for commerce or affecting commerce.

Equal minimum wage, maximum hours and child labor protection for farm workers, as for other workers.

A single minimum wage and maximum hours standard for all workers, regardless of age, sex, color, or creed.

These goals have been the ultimate achievement Congress has been seeking for 34 years.

While the Congress is considering modest improvements, the administration is recommending a measure that would undermine the minimum wage, by establishing a special subminimum rate for youth. My proposal

gives a reasonable percentage lower rate for bona fide student youths.

In his economic report to the Congress on January 27, 1972, the President proposed "revision of the minimum wage system to remove obstacles to the employment of young and inexperienced workers." What the President failed to report is that a subminimum rate for youth would not create any new jobs for young people. We recognize the need for youth jobs, but more compelling, we recognize the need for employment at reasonable wages for adult workers.

Obviously, some employers would fire older workers, including heads of families, and substitute for them the cheapest labor available—the youths the President would condemn to subminimum wages. That would not increase employment; it would merely rearrange the statistics of unemployment.

The AFL-CIO makes a plea for immediate action, favorably on H.R. 7130, the Dent bill. The latest release from labor states:

In the name of simple dignity and common sense, we demand the Congress update the Fair Labor Standards Act without further delay and send to the President a measure that meets the test of the times.

Congress should remember that the workers who benefit from raised wage rates under the Dent bill are not as a rule protected by union contracts.

The U.S. Congress is charged with the responsibility of keeping minimum wages for about 7 percent of the work force in line with the Cost Of Living index.

We have failed to do this. We have completely ignored this great group of workers since we have not negotiated by law an increase for the bulk of these workers since 1967. We placed a ceiling of \$1.60 an hour on millions of workers in 1967. If they had received the same raises granted by Congress to all civil employees since 1967 based upon the Cost of Living Index figures, these millions of workers would today be getting \$2.38 an hour.

I, personally, feel that the \$2 asked for by my committee is still below the minimum requirements of a worker.

Any further delay by the Rules Committee will increase the gap between the needs of the workers and their earnings under the minimum wage. I am seriously considering asking for the discharge of the Rules Committee from consideration of H.R. 7130. I have been waiting patiently for action, but apparently certain members of the Rules Committee are not favorably disposed to such action.

Along with increasing wages of civil workers, Congress has a moral and legal obligation to raise the minimum wage schedule in keeping with the cost-of-living increases under the provisions of the U.S. Fair Labor Standards Act.

To do less, to arbitrarily refuse to allow the House to fulfill its obligations to millions of people working at poverty wages, is an indictment of the procedures of the Rules Committee.

Any further delay may cause the Congress to reevaluate the House rules that allow any committee to delay or pigeon-

hole any bill approved by a duly constituted House committee.

THE FAA DICTATES—PART I

(Mr. KARTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I am beginning today what will be a series of remarks and reports to you and our colleagues concerning the interference by the FAA Administrator, Mr. John H. Shaffer, in what he himself called, an essentially State and local matter concerning the Minneapolis-St. Paul area. From the start, Mr. Speaker, I point out that this series of reports is not being placed on the record in an attempt to embarrass this particular Washington bureaucrat. As a matter of fact, this action I am taking should come as no surprise to him since I advised the Administrator over a year ago of my intention to place a full story of his involvement on the record. I did not do so at that time because at a subsequent meeting Mr. Shaffer promised he would not participate further in pressuring local authorities on matters concerning an airport site location.

Fortunately, his judgment on the site of his choice has since been rejected by local officials. Fortunately, in arriving at their decision they took into consideration social, environmental and economic issues as well as aeronautical needs. Because his dictates were not acceptable he is now interfering again.

Therefore, I believe his actions demand that they be brought to the attention of our colleagues as a warning of what one may expect if a substantial part of the community, elected officials, a planning agency, and a Federal and State agency disagree with the views of Mr. Shaffer.

I want to make it clear that I accept and encourage the right of the Administrator to hold and express an opinion on aviation matters. But I believe, as my reports will show, that he has overstepped both his authority and the bounds of propriety when he repeatedly interjects his personal opinion, devoid of social, environmental and economic factors, resorts to intimidation of local officials, questions the motives of elected officials, makes disdainful and petty remarks concerning elected officials, judgment, and deals in contradictions—telling the press one thing and elected officials another.

Typically and in accord with this display of bureaucratic arrogance his latest intemperate remarks are directed to those who argue that the Twin Cities do not need two major airports or if they do, that all factors be considered.

His attitude is summed up well by the first paragraph of a story that appeared in the February 1, 1972, edition of the Minneapolis Star:

If Minneapolis and St. Paul don't feel they need a new airport, they can "be just the way they are, fat, dumb and happy, and be without modern air transportation," John A. Shaffer, head of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) said Monday.

Incredibly Mr. Shaffer goes on to say, in complete contradiction of his actions and of the very statements he made during the course of the interview the Star is reporting, the following:

There is not going to be any federal pressure to get the Twin Cities area to build a new airport, Shaffer said in a telephone interview from his Washington office.

If they don't want progress and don't want to grow and expand, that is their decision, he said.

Mr. Shaffer continued the unusual tone of his remarks concerning those who say a second airport might not be needed with the following:

Shaffer said those who argue the Twin Cities area does not need two major airports are "myopic," "archaic" and have their heads in the sand.

"I hate to rail and rant, but it just fries me to hear such argument," Shaffer said.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a report of Mr. Shaffer's latest remarks on the subject. In my next report I shall further background his involvement and dictatorial attitude toward this subject.

As a matter of record for those members who are interested, a complete copy of the article I refer to today—as well as copies of articles and letters I will refer to in future reports—are on file in my office.

STATEMENT OF AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON THE SPACE SHUTTLE

(Mr. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the AFL-CIO Executive Council, in its recent meeting at Bal Harbour, Fla., issued a well-reasoned and persuasive statement on the importance of the development and funding of the space shuttle. As that statement points out so well, development of the space shuttle "will make space as accessible as the airplane has made the other continents." The program, in addition, will assist us in exploration, science, and technology and will provide approximately 50,000 jobs throughout the United States. I highly recommend that my colleagues in the House read and analyze this statement, and I ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON SPACE SHUTTLE, BAL HARBOUR, FLA., FEBRUARY 18, 1972

The United States space program is reaching another milestone. At the peak of the Apollo project, the space program employed 400,000 Americans—about half of whom have since been laid off. This year will see the end of Apollo.

In Apollo, American science, engineering and craftsmanship made possible the fulfillment of one of man's oldest dreams—to walk on the moon. In so doing, we unlocked vast new technologies, strengthened our national security and reinforced America's world position.

Next year, the Skylab project will put nine astronauts into orbit to live and work for periods of from four to eight weeks, learning more about our world and the space around it.

The next logical step for the United States space program is the development of a space shuttle which will provide economical transportation from earth to space and back. It will make space as accessible as the airplane has made the other continents. The shuttle will assist us in exploration, in science and technology and, if necessary, in defense and provide 50,000 jobs in the United States. Without the shuttle we cannot develop our scientific and technological investments that already have given us space communications, weather satellites and geodetic programs.

The benefits of next generation space applications in such fields as the management of our natural resources, monitoring of pollution, weather modification and climate control, television distribution, earthquake prediction, and public health and safety will not be fully realized unless we can reduce costs, raise efficiency and acquire a flexibility of action not yet possible. That is what the space shuttle is for. Without it, we will lose many valuable programs.

International relations today involve space. We can no more ignore space than we can ignore the oceans or the continents. We would not have the free world without ships, without aircraft or without land mobility. We cannot envision a secure, technologically advanced western world without technologies that allow us the freedom of space as well.

For these reasons, we urge Congress to vote funds for the development of a space shuttle.

UNEMPLOYED VIETNAM VETERAN APPLIES FOR JOB AS STAGEHAND AT KENNEDY CENTER

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter today that I wish to share with other Members. It reads, in part, as follows:

As an unemployed Vietnam veteran desperately in need of a job, I am appealing to you for help.

After reading your weekly newsletter, I was wondering how I might go about applying for a job as a stagehand at the Kennedy Center for \$1,500 per week.

Any information you can give me would be deeply appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that Roger Stevens and other "friends" of this so-called culture palace read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Their devotion to padded salaries and culture for the jet set at a time when Vietnam veterans cannot find jobs is indeed touching.

OMNIBUS HIGHWAY SAFETY ACT OF 1972

(Mr. HARSHA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, according to National Safety Council figures, in 1971 over 50,000 people died, 2 million people were injured, and \$14 million in property damages were sustained as a result of traffic accidents on the Nation's highways.

Throughout the decade of the sixties, almost half a million men, women, and children were killed, over 17 million were injured, and \$90 billion in economic damages were sustained.

Since the beginning of the automo-

bile age in 1900, almost 2 million people lost their lives in highway accidents, and untold billions of dollars in lost wages and productive resources were sustained.

The deep sense of personal loss to families, relatives, friends, and associates from these accidents was incalculable. And the horrendous toll continues. Every 10 minutes of every day, two persons are killed and an additional 200 were injured. The cost of such accidents for each 10-minute period runs to over half a million dollars.

This is an appalling squandering of lives and treasure. The gravity of the situation can be illustrated by the fact that highway deaths outnumbered combat losses in Vietnam over the period of the war by a factor approaching 10 to 1.

I hold intense feelings concerning the issue of highway safety. I believe the carnage on our highways is man's grossest inhumanity to himself. We can ill afford its continuance.

Back in 1966, the Congress passed the Highway Safety Act. Its aim was to provide the legislative wherewithal for mounting a nationwide campaign to arrest, and, if possible, reverse the escalating mayhem on our highways. Unfortunately, from the beginning, the highway safety program has been severely hampered by a shortage of funds. This has meant that much-needed research, development, and demonstration programs have been slighted, and methods and techniques found to be effective in reducing accidents have not been implemented on a nationwide basis.

Members of the Committee on Public Works, upon which I serve as ranking minority member, are deeply concerned over the highway safety problem. On February 17, 1972, we began hearings looking to the development of new plans and programs for reducing the highway accident and injury toll. There is a consensus on the committee that we must develop new safety programs of a magnitude never before conceived. We are agreed that the problems of deaths, injuries, and economic waste will not be substantially reduced without a substantial increase in Federal expenditures and a dedicated marshaling of the best available talent in a safety crusade.

To suggest this does not mean that there has been no progress to date. Since the 1966 act was passed, sizable steps have been taken toward dealing with highway safety problems. But we have not yet succeeded in reversing the tide.

I believe the time has come for major new initiatives in the highway safety field. If, through such initiatives, we can reduce by one-tenth the accidents and injuries on our highways, then the real-life and real-dollar savings that we will make will more than pay for the effort and will yield a handsome dividend besides.

Accordingly, I am introducing today an omnibus highway safety bill which I believe will do that and more. Joining with me in cosponsoring this measure are all 37 members of the Committee on Public Works, including Chairman BLAT-

NIK. This splendid bipartisan showing of unanimity by the members of the committee indicates their dedication and commitment to the cause of highway safety. It is through such dedication and commitment that we can hopefully, at long last come effectively to grips with and solve the problem of deaths and injuries on the Nation's highways.

To fund this bill will require an investment of approximately \$850 million annually for fiscal years 1974 and 1975. Two-thirds of this sum will be authorized from the highway trust fund, and one-third from the general fund.

If the moneys authorized are provided for fully implementing the provisions of this measure, I predict that upwards of 10,000 Americans will be alive to enjoy the Nation's bicentennial celebration who otherwise would have died in highway mishaps.

A summary of the provisions of the Omnibus Highway Safety Act of 1972 follows:

**OMNIBUS HIGHWAY SAFETY ACT OF 1972—
SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS**

(1) *Special Pavement Marking Program*—A \$200 million two-year program to stripe all roads of the Nation which are presently poorly striped or not marked at all. This program would be specifically targeted at State and county secondary roads in rural areas where an inordinate number of highway fatalities occur.

(2) *Pavement Marking Research and Demonstration*—A national striping program would be extremely beneficial and save a great many lives. But the benefits of pavement marking all but disappear during bad weather conditions. In order to get a handle on this problem, a strong research effort in the field of wet and bad weather marking is urgently needed. Complemented by follow-on demonstration projects, new techniques and technology could be developed for solving the bad weather marking problem. \$30 million would be provided for this purpose.

(3) *White House Conference on Highway Safety*—Last September, I proposed that a White House Conference be held to focus national attention on the safety problem. The enthusiastic response that proposal received convinces me that such a Conference should be held in 1973—the year that Emperor Haile Selassie has suggested be designated as "International Highway Safety Year".

(4) *Drug Use and Driver Behavior Highway Safety Research*—While money is presently being spent on basic research in the alcohol field, very little work has been done insofar as drugs are concerned. Nor is the area of accident-prone drivers receiving the attention it deserves. We cannot continue to virtually ignore these latter two problem areas and expect to effectively cope with the highway safety problem. An adequate research foundation must be built. A basic research program should be funded at a \$25 million annual level to mobilize basic research capabilities at all levels of government and in the private sector.

(5) *Projects for High Hazard Locations (Spot Improvements)*—As you know, the spot improvements program was deleted from the Highway Act of 1970. This much-needed program for dealing with high hazard locations should be reestablished. A \$100 million annual program divided $\frac{2}{3}$ for high hazard locations on the Federal-aid highway system and $\frac{1}{3}$ for those off the system, would save a great many lives.

(6) *Program for Elimination of Roadside Obstacles*—Investigations by the Oversight

Subcommittee confirm that roadside obstacles are a major cause of accidents, injuries and deaths on the Nation's highways. By funding a long-range program to eliminate such obstacles, replacing them with breakaway signs, etc., a principal cause of needless deaths and injuries could be eliminated in this decade \$100 million annually would be provided for this effort.

(7) *Highway Safety Educational Programming and Study*—Realistically, the best way to educate and involve the general public is through wide-spread use of mass media. Present media efforts are confined to 30 or 60-second radio and TV spots. Thus far, at least, these have failed to alert, educate or involve the American driving public. We need to study and develop new media methods and techniques for educating and informing the general public in the field of highway safety. To that end, \$1,000,000 is authorized for a study and assessment of current media efforts and the formulation of recommendations for future programming. An additional \$4,000,000 is authorized for the development of highway safety pilot television messages of varying length for future use to educate and inform the general public.

(8) *Citizen Participation Study*—If a safety crusade is to succeed, wide citizen involvement is absolutely essential. Ways and means for encouraging greater citizen participation in the traffic enforcement process must be developed. Citizen involvement could take any of several forms. A Citizen's Traffic Reserve Corps, which would serve as an adjunct of professional law enforcement organizations, as well as other alternatives, would be considered. \$1 million would be authorized for this study.

(9) *Feasibility Study—National Center for Statistical Analysis of Highway Operations*—One of the greatest weaknesses of the present highway safety effort is the lack of specific, up-to-date, comprehensive data to support action programs. Consideration should be given to establishing a national system for uniform reporting of all accidents nationwide. Such a system would provide Federal, State and local authorities with continuous oversight over highway performance. Ultimately, it should be possible to get a clear picture of what is happening on the Nation's highways on a day-to-day basis. A study looking to the feasibility of a National Center for Statistical Analysis of Highway Operations, the cost of setting up and maintaining it, as well as problems associated with such an undertaking, could prove extremely useful. \$5 million would be authorized for the conduct of this study.

(10) *Highway Safety Research and Development (Section 403)*—At the present time, 35 Alcohol Safety Action Programs (ASAP's) to demonstrate new safety techniques are in operation around the country. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration would like to increase this figure to 52 (one for each State, D.C. and Puerto Rico). The aim would be to have a program focus within every jurisdiction throughout the country. To accomplish this purpose, NHTSA Section 403 funding would be boosted by an additional \$100 million annually. The total 403 authorization for NHTSA programs would thus be \$235 million annually for fiscal years 1974 and 1975. In addition, Sections 307(a) and 403 monies for the Federal Highway Administration would be doubled to \$20 million annually.

(11) *Highway Safety Program (Section 402)*—NHTSA is concerned about what will replace ASAP programs when they come to an end. The agency would like to be able to transform 403 demonstration programs which prove successful into permanent State (402) types of programs. To provide for their evolution, an additional \$100 million annually would be authorized for the next two fiscal years. Funding for Section 402 pro-

gram administered by the Federal Highway Administration would be doubled to \$60 million annually for the same period.

(12) *Safety Standards and Inspection of Motor Vehicles in Use*—The question of establishing diagnostic inspection, registration, and titling standards for motor vehicles in use is one that has not received the attention it deserves. Just how far the Congress can and should go in this area, the means and methods which should be used, and the costs for supporting such a program, must be studied and determined on a cost/benefit basis. Inclusion in the Omnibus bill will enable the Committee on Public Works to address itself to these questions.

* * * * *

The amount of money needed to carry out the foregoing safety action programs will amount to \$835 million for each of fiscal years 1974 and 1975, two-thirds of such sums coming from the Highway Trust Fund, and one-third from the general fund.

An additional \$13 million to carry out the studies proposed would be authorized exclusively from the Highway Trust Fund.

Total cost for the two fiscal years to implement the Omnibus Highway Safety Act of 1972 would come to \$1,683 billion—a small price to pay for the lives likely to be saved, the injuries avoided and property damage prevented.

The provisions of the Omnibus bill follow:

H.R. 13539

A bill to authorize appropriations for certain highway safety projects, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Omnibus Highway Safety Act of 1972".

PAVEMENT MARKING PROGRAM

SEC. 2. (a) Chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 145. Special pavement marking program

"(a) Congress hereby finds and declares it to be in the vital interest of the Nation that a special pavement marking program be established to enable the several States to improve the pavement marking of all highways to provide for greater vehicle and pedestrian safety.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of the last sentence of subsection (a) of section 105 of this title, the Secretary may approve under this section such pavement marking projects on any highway whether or not on any Federal-aid system, but not included in the Interstate System, as he may find necessary to bring such highway to the pavement marking standards issued or endorsed by the Federal Highway Administrator.

"(c) In approving projects under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to those projects which are located in rural areas and which are either on the Federal-aid secondary system or are not included in any Federal-aid system.

"(d) The entire cost of projects approved under subsections (b) and (f) of this section shall be paid from sums authorized to carry out this section.

"(e) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section by the Federal Highway Administration, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1974, and June 30, 1975, the sum of \$100,000,000, to be available until expended, except that two-thirds of all funds authorized and expended under authority of this section in any fiscal year shall be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund. Such sums shall be available for obligation at the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized in the same

manner and to the same extent as if such funds were apportioned under this chapter. Such funds shall be apportioned on the same basis as is provided in paragraph (2) of section 104(b) of this title.

"(f) Funds apportioned to a State but not required by it for pavement marking projects authorized by this section may be released by the Secretary to such State for expenditure for projects to eliminate or reduce the hazards to safety at specific locations or sections of highways which are not located on any Federal-aid system and which have high accident experiences or high accident potentials. Funds may be released by the Secretary under this subsection only if the Secretary has received satisfactory assurances from the State highway department that all non-urban area highways within the State are marked in accordance with the pavement marking standards issued or endorsed by the Federal Highway Administration.

"(g) Each State shall report to the Secretary in January 1975, and in each January thereafter for three years following completion within that State of the special pavement marking program authorized by this section, with respect to the effectiveness of the pavement marking improvements accomplished since commencement of the program. The report shall include an analysis and evaluation with respect to the number, rate, and severity of accidents at improved locations, and the cost-benefit ratio of such improvements, comparing a period of one year prior to completion of improvements to annual periods subsequent to completion of such improvements. The Secretary shall submit a report to Congress not later than June 30, 1975, and not later than June 30 of each year thereafter until completion of the special pavement marking program authorized by this section, with respect to the effectiveness of the pavement marking improvements accomplished by the several States under this section."

(b) The analysis of chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"— Special pavement marking program."

PAVEMENT MARKING RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

SEC. 3. (a) In addition to the research authorized by section 307(a) of title 23, United States Code, the Secretary of Transportation is authorized to conduct research and demonstration programs with respect to the effectiveness of various types of pavement markings under inclement weather and nighttime conditions.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section by the Federal Highway Administration, for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1974, and June 30, 1975, the sum of \$25,000,000, to be available until expended, except that two-thirds of all funds authorized and expended under authority of this section in any fiscal year shall be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON HIGHWAY SAFETY

SEC. 4. (a) Within one year of the enactment of this section, the President shall convene a White House Conference on Highway Safety, hereinafter referred to as the "Conference".

(b) The Conference shall bring together all elements of our society concerned with promoting safety on our highways. It shall include, but not be limited to, highway engineers, contractors, users, safety experts, representatives of the insurance, automobile, communications, and other affected industries and organizations, and such interested citizens as may be designated by the President to attend.

(c) The purpose of the Conference shall be to (1) encourage more vigorous State and local highway safety programs; (2) stimulate the efforts of non-governmental agencies, organizations, institutions, businesses, and individuals in the field of highway safety; (3) encourage more effective communication between public and private institutions concerned with highway safety; (4) seek to identify specific highway problems for priority attention; (5) study methods of financing and possible sources of Federal funds to carry out new avenues of research, development, and demonstration programs; and (6) recommend such modifications or additions to existing laws, regulations, policies, and practices as will, in the judgment of the Conference, achieve workable and effective highway safety programs.

(d) Participants in the Conference shall receive no compensation, other than expense allowances, from the United States Government by reason of their participation in the Conference.

(e) Each department and agency of the United States shall, to the extent permitted by law and within the limits of available funds, furnish such information and assistance to the Conference as may be necessary to carry out its functions.

(f) The President shall transmit to the Congress, not later than July 1, 1973, a report on the Conference, together with his recommendations, if any.

(g) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund the sum of \$2,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this section.

DRUG USE AND DRIVER BEHAVIOR HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH

SEC. 5. (a) Section 403 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately before the first sentence thereof, and by striking out "this section" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "this subsection", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) In addition to the research authorized by subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary, in consultation with such other government and private agencies as may be necessary, is authorized to carry out safety research on the following:

"(1) The relationship between the consumption and use of drugs and their effect upon highway safety and drivers of motor vehicles, in consultation with such other government and private agencies as may be necessary.

"(2) Driver behavior research, including the characteristics of driver performance, the relationships of mental and physical abilities to the driving task, and the relationship of frequency of driver accident involvement to highway safety.

"(c) The research authorized by subsection (b) of this section may be conducted by the Secretary through grants and contracts with public and private agencies, institutions, and individuals."

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration the sum of \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, except that two-thirds of all funds authorized and expended under authority of this section in any fiscal year shall be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund.

PROJECTS FOR HIGH HAZARD LOCATIONS (SPOT IMPROVEMENTS)

SEC. 6. (a) Chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof (after the section added by section 2 of this Act) the following new section:

"§ 146. Projects for high hazard locations

"(a) for projects to eliminate or reduce the hazards at specific locations or sections of highways which have high accident experiences or high accident potentials, by the Federal Highway Administration, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1974, and June 30, 1975, the sum of \$100,000,000, to be available until expended, except that two-thirds of all funds authorized and expended under authority of this section in any fiscal year shall be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund. Such sums shall be available for obligation for one year in advance of the fiscal year for which authorized and shall remain available for obligation for a period of two years after the close of the fiscal year for which authorized.

"(b) Funds authorized by this section shall be available for expenditure as follows:

"(1) Two-thirds for projects on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems and their extensions within urban areas; and

"(2) One-third for projects on highways not included on any Federal-aid system.

"(c) Funds made available in accordance with paragraph (1) of subsection (b) shall be apportioned to the States in the same manner as sums authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1) of section 105 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970. Funds made available in accordance with paragraph (2) of subsection (b) shall be apportioned to the States in the same manner as is provided in section 402(c) of this title, and the Federal share payable on account of any such project shall not exceed 90 per centum of the cost thereof."

(b) The analysis of chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"§ 146. Projects for high hazard locations."

PROGRAMS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF ROADSIDE OBSTACLES

SEC. 7. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 402 (b) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(F) provide for a comprehensive program for the elimination of roadside hazards, including, but not limited to, the following minimum requirements: (i) each State shall conduct a survey of all expressways, major streets and highways, and through streets for the identification of roadside obstacles which may constitute a hazard to an out-of-control vehicle, assign priorities, and establish and implement a schedule for correction of hazards; (ii) the schedule of improvements referred to in clause (i) of this subparagraph shall provide for the replacement, to the extent appropriate, for existing sign and light supports which are not designed to yield or break away upon impact; and (iii) yielding or breakaway sign and light supports shall be used, to the extent appropriate, on all new construction or reconstruction of highways referred to in clause (i) of this subparagraph."

(b) Commencing in 1974, the Secretary of Transportation shall, in the report to Congress required to be submitted by section 202 of the Highway Safety Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 731; Public Law 89-564), include an analysis and evaluation of the progress made by the several States during the preceding calendar year in implementing improvements for the elimination of roadside obstacles. The report shall indicate the action taken by the Secretary, if any, as authorized by section 402(c) of title 23, United States Code, with respect to any State found not to be in substantial compliance with its schedule of improvements required by section 402(b) (1) (F) of title 23, United States Code.

(c) Subsection (g) of section 402 of title

23, United States Code, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "except that funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section may be used for the elimination of roadside hazards on highways not included in any Federal-aid system, as part of a State's comprehensive program as required by subparagraph (F) of subsection (b) (1) of this section."

(d) In addition to sums otherwise authorized by section 12(b) of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for carrying out projects for the elimination of roadside obstacles authorized by this section for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1974, and June 30, 1975, the sum of \$100,000,000 to be available until expended, except that two-thirds of all funds authorized and expended under authority of this subsection in any fiscal year shall be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund. Such sums shall be available for obligation at the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized in the same name, and to the same extent as if such sums were apportioned under chapter 4 of title 23, United States Code.

HIGHWAY SAFETY EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMMING AND STUDY

SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary of Transportation, in cooperation with interested government and non-government authorities, agencies, organizations, institutions, businesses, and individuals, shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the use of mass media and other techniques for informing the public of means and methods for reducing the number and severity of highway accidents. Such a study shall include, but not be limited to, ways and means for encouraging the participation and cooperation of television and radio station licensees, for measuring audience reactions to current educational programs, for evaluating the effectiveness of such programs, and for developing future programs for the promotion of highway safety. The Secretary shall report to the Congress his findings and recommendations by January 1, 1974.

(b) For the purpose of carrying out subsection (a) of this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$1,000,000 out of the Highway Trust Fund.

(c) The Secretary of Transportation shall develop highway safety pilot television messages of varying length, up to and including five minutes, for use in accordance with the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934.

(d) For the purpose of carrying out subsection (c) of this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$4,000,000 out of the Highway Trust Fund.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION STUDY

SEC. 9. (a) The Secretary of Transportation, in cooperation with State and local traffic safety authorities, shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of ways and means for encouraging greater citizen participation and involvement in the traffic enforcement process, including, but not limited to, the creation of citizen adjuncts to assist professional traffic enforcement agencies in the performance of their duties. The Secretary shall report to the Congress his findings and recommendations by January 1, 1974.

(b) For the purposes of carrying out this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$1,000,000 out of the Highway Trust Fund.

FEASIBILITY STUDY—NATIONAL CENTER FOR STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF HIGHWAY OPERATIONS

SEC. 10. (a) The Secretary of Transportation shall make a thorough study of the feasibility of establishing a National Center for

Statistical Analysis of Highway Operations designed to acquire, store, and retrieve highway accident data and standardize the information and procedures for reporting accidents on a nationwide basis. Such study should include an estimate of the cost of establishing and maintaining such a center. The Secretary shall report to the Congress his findings and recommendations not later than June 30, 1973.

(b) For the purpose of carrying out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$5,000,000 out of the Highway Trust Fund.

HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 11. (a) For carrying out section 403 of title 23, United States Code (relating to highway safety research and development), by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1974, and June 30, 1975, the sum of \$215,000,000, except that two-thirds of all funds authorized and expended under authority of this subsection for such section 403 in any fiscal year shall be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund.

(b) For carrying out sections 307(a) and 403 of title 23, United States Code (relating to highway safety research and development), by the Federal Highway Administration, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1974, and June 30, 1975, the sum of \$20,000,000, except that two-thirds of all funds authorized and expended under authority of this subsection for such sections 307(a) and 403 in any fiscal year shall be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund.

HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS

SEC. 12. (a) For carrying out section 402 of title 23, United States Code (relating to highway safety programs), by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1974, and June 30, 1975, the sum of \$200,000,000, except that two-thirds of all funds authorized and expended under authority of this subsection for such section 402 in any fiscal year shall be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund.

(b) For carrying out section 402 of title 23, United States Code (relating to highway safety programs), by the Federal Highway Administration, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1974, and June 30, 1975, the sum of \$80,000,000, except that two-thirds of all funds authorized and expended under authority of this subsection for such section 402 in any fiscal year shall be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund.

SAFETY STANDARDS AND INSPECTION OF MOTOR VEHICLES IN USE

SEC. 13. (a) Congress hereby finds and declares it to be in the vital interest of the Nation that a coordinated Federal, State, and local program be established and implemented to improve the safety qualities of motor vehicles now in use. Section 108(b) (1) of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 (15 USC 1397(b) (1)) required the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a study pertaining to the safety of motor vehicles in use and to report to the Congress not later than September 9, 1967, the results of such study. It was further required that the Secretary establish, no later than one year from the date of submission of such report, uniform Federal motor vehicle safety standards applicable to all used vehicles. The report called for by section 108 (b) (1) of such Act was submitted to the Congress on June 24, 1968. Highway safety program standard number 1, issued June 27, 1967, under the provisions of section 402(a)

of title 23, United States Code, requires each State to have programs for periodic inspection of all registered vehicles.

(b) After December 31, 1973, no funds may be expended to discharge the functions of the Secretary with respect to traffic and highway safety programs administered by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, until such time as the Secretary establishes uniform Federal motor vehicle safety standards applicable to all used vehicles as required by section 108(b) (1) of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 (15 USC 1397(b) (1)).

(c) The Secretary shall, not later than January 1, 1973, amend highway safety program standard numbered 1, relating to periodic motor vehicle inspection, issued June 27, 1967, under the provisions of section 402 (a) of title 23, United States Code, to include the following additional provisions:

(1) The standard shall require inspection of a motor vehicle whenever the title to the motor vehicle is transferred for purposes other than resale, and whenever the motor vehicle sustains damage if any safety-related mechanism, subsystem, or functional non-operational part, as defined by the Secretary, is damaged.

(2) The standard shall require that a certificate of safe operating condition shall be delivered by the seller of a motor vehicle to the purchaser at the time of sale. The certificate shall be prepared and signed by an inspector trained to perform this duty. The inspector shall be certified by the State in accordance with provisions established by the Secretary. No motor vehicle inspector may be certified by any State if he owns or receives any benefit in or from a business or enterprise engaged in the repair or sale of motor vehicles, automotive repair parts, or accessories: *Provided*, That, upon approval of the Secretary, a State may certify a motor vehicle inspector receiving such benefit where the vehicle population to be served is insufficient to make independent motor vehicle inspectors feasible and such State makes provision for protecting the public from any conflict of interest resulting from such certification.

(3) The standard shall be expressed in terms of motor vehicle safety performance applicable to new or used motor vehicles.

(d) The Secretary shall, not later than January 1, 1973, amend highway safety program standard numbered 2, relating to motor vehicle registration, issued on June 27, 1967, under the provisions of section 402(a) of title 23, United States Code, to include requirements for a State motor vehicle registration and uniform certificate of title program similar to the registration and title program contemplated by the Uniform Motor Vehicle Code and Model Traffic Ordinance, chapter 3, "Certificates of Title and Registration of Vehicles," revised in 1968 and published by the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances, Washington, District of Columbia.

(e) The Secretary shall report to the President and Congress by January 1, 1973, the extent to which the States have implemented programs in accordance with the provisions of highway safety program standards numbered 1 and 2, relating to periodic motor vehicle inspection and motor vehicle registration, respectively, as issued on June 27, 1967, and make legislative recommendations for Federal financial and other assistance, as he deems necessary in order to facilitate full compliance by the States.

(f) The Secretary shall report to the President and Congress by January 1, 1974, the extent to which the States have implemented programs in accordance with the provisions of this section, and make legislative recommendations, for Federal financial and other assistance, as he deems necessary to facilitate full compliance by the States.

AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS NAMES NAOMI BRONHEIM LEVINE AS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

(Mrs. ABZUG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the American Jewish Congress has chosen as its new executive director one of this country's outstanding women, a good friend of mine for many years. Naomi Bronheim Levine today becomes the first woman to lead a major Jewish organization of both men and women, and her appointment is another indication of the progress women are making in every field. I am especially pleased at this timely announcement since Mrs. Levine is a colleague and very dear friend of mine from Hunter College and Columbia Law School. I can vouch for her competence, energy, and enthusiasm in everything she undertakes, and I congratulate the American Jewish Congress for its excellent choice. I have here an article on the appointment from today's New York Times and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

NEW JEWISH LEADER: NAOMI BRONHEIM LEVINE

When Naomi Bronheim Levine was growing up in the Bronx she had a lisp and later, after college, it kept her from becoming a schoolteacher.

But it was a challenge to overcome, as she was to overcome the challenge of combining a career with family. She succeeded with both, and yesterday Mrs. Levine, wife and mother, was appointed executive director of the American Jewish Congress, the first woman to head the staff of a major Jewish organization of both men and women.

Her appointment was, she said, "a complete surprise," but the job itself, directing the work of about 75,000 members scattered throughout 18 regional offices and 300 chapters, was something she was sure she could handle. "I'm not a particularly modest person," Mrs. Levine said.

Mrs. Levine is tough but feminine, able and articulate, yet she is afraid to go into politics, which attracts her, because, she said, a politician cannot say what he or she thinks and be successful. And, she acknowledged, she does want to be successful.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR FAMILY

Philosophically, she bridges the time when women first became seriously career-minded and today's "women's liberation" movement.

"Women's lib is probably correct, but it's not my style," she said.

"I still feel somewhat guilty when I spend too much time away from home and if my daughter got sick I would stay home and care for her—I wouldn't expect my husband to. The young girls today think differently and they're right."

Nonetheless, because she is a successful career woman—not despite the fact—she has had to work harder than most perhaps at her marriage of 23 years to Leonard Levine, an accountant.

"There have been problems, but we share many things at home, and we've never had to discuss my working much," she says. "We just do and help each other."

"He lets me handle the social problems of the world and he makes the money," Mrs. Levine says of her husband. "What I do is very important to me, and I could have life no other way."

The couple have a daughter, Joan, 23, a recent graduate of New York University, who

has an apartment in Greenwich Village. Miss Levine, who plans to become a teacher, said yesterday that she could not recall having ever suffered from having a successful mother.

"I always looked up to her and thought of her as a brilliant woman," she continued. "It's hard for me to imagine a woman who didn't have a career. She made me look to a career. There are a lot of men frightened of such a woman, but my father is obviously not one of them."

Naomi Bronheim was born on April 15, 1923, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Nat Bronheim. Her younger brother, David, was director of the Alliance for Progress under President John F. Kennedy and was a director of the Center of Inter-American Affairs.

Mrs. Levine attended Hunter College High School, one of the most difficult in the city to get into, and then Hunter College, from which she graduated in 1940, intending to become a public school teacher. "I passed the written exam, but failed the oral because of my lisp," she recalled.

A teacher suggested that she go to law school instead, and so she enrolled at Columbia. She graduated in 1944 and was an editor of the Law Review.

Only for a short period of time did she engage in private law practice. "But there, you see, I felt guilty about the time I was taking away from my family so I quit."

Mrs. Levine, who has been at the American-Jewish Congress for 21 years, succeeds Will Maslow as executive director. Mr. Maslow served in the post for 12 years and will continue as general counsel.

PROFESSOR AT JOHN JAY

Mrs. Levine's only major regret about her new job, she said, is that she will have to give up her professorship at the John Jay College of Criminal Justice where, for four years, she has been teaching policemen about law and race relations and the American judicial system.

Her minor regret is the prospect of flying, which she hates. As executive director of an organization with an annual budget of \$2.5-million she will, in her new job, have to do a lot of traveling to speak and raise funds.

Mrs. Levine and her husband live in a seven-room apartment on West End Avenue and 85th Street.

Her hobbies are reading and going to the theater. Recently she hired two young scholars at Yeshiva University to give her private tutoring in Jewish history, all of which proves, her husband says, is that she is extravagant."

UNFOUNDED CRITICISM OF PRESIDENT NIXON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Mazoli). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. WYMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, like much other criticism of President Nixon during the "silly season" the charges of a sellout of Taiwan arising from the President's visit to mainland China are unfounded. It is extremely unfortunate that Republican colleagues in the course of a primary campaign should see fit to make such unjustifiable charges, implying a dishonorable course of action to an honorable and distinguished President of their own political party.

Now, what are the facts? First, on February 9, 1972, in a message to the Congress President Nixon said concerning the relationship between his pending visit to mainland China and its effect on

American commitment to Taiwan, I quote:

What are the implications for our long-standing ties to the Republic of China? In my address announcing my trip to Peking, and since, then, I have emphasized that our new dialogue with the PRC would not be at the expense of friends. Nevertheless, we recognize that this process cannot help but be painful for our old friend on Taiwan, the Republic of China. Our position is clear. We exerted the maximum diplomatic efforts to retain its seat in the United Nations. We regret the decision of the General Assembly to deprive the Republic of China of its representation although we welcomed the admission of the People's Republic of China. With the Republic of China, we shall maintain our friendship, our diplomatic ties, and our defense commitment. The ultimate relationship between Taiwan and the mainland is not a matter for the United States to decide. A peaceful resolution of this problem by the parties would do much to reduce tension in the Far East. We are not, however, urging either party to follow any particular course.

Now, what are the existing treaty provisions with Taiwan?

A mutual defense treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of China was entered into on December 13, 1954.

This treaty provides as follows:

Mutual Defense Treaty Between the United States of America and the Republic of China: The Parties to this Treaty,

Reaffirming their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all Governments, and desiring to strengthen the fabric of peace in the West Pacific Area,

Recalling with mutual pride the relationship which brought their two peoples together in a common bond of sympathy and mutual ideals to fight side by side against imperialist aggression during the last war,

Desiring to declare publicly and formally their sense of unity and their common determination to defend themselves against external armed attack, so that no potential aggressor could be under the illusion that either of them stands alone in the West Pacific Area, and

Desiring further to strengthen their present efforts for collective defense for the preservation of peace and security pending the development of a more comprehensive system of regional security in the West Pacific Area, Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

The Parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international dispute in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace, security and justice are not endangered and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner consistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

ARTICLE II

In order more effectively to achieve the objective of this Treaty, the Parties separately and jointly by self-help and mutual aid will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack and Communist subversive activities directed from without against their territorial integrity and political stability.

ARTICLE III

The Parties undertake to strengthen their free institutions and to cooperate with each other in the development of economic progress and social well-being and to further their

individual and collective efforts toward these ends.

ARTICLE IV

The Parties, through their Foreign Ministers or their deputies, will consult together from time to time regarding the implementation of this Treaty.

ARTICLE V

Each Party recognizes that an armed attack in the West Pacific Area directed against the territories of either of the Parties would be dangerous to its own peace and safety and declares that it would act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes.

Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security.

ARTICLE VI

For the purposes of Articles II and V, the terms "territorial" and "territories" shall mean in respect of the Republic of China, Taiwan and the Pescadores; and in respect of the United States of America the island territories in the West Pacific under its jurisdiction. The provisions of Articles II and V will be applicable to such other territories as may be determined by mutual agreement.

ARTICLE VII

The Government of the Republic of China grants, and the Government of the United States of America accepts, the right to dispose such United States land, air and sea forces in and about Taiwan and the Pescadores as may be required for their defense, as determined by mutual agreement.

ARTICLE VIII

This Treaty does not affect and shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the rights and obligations of the Parties under the Charter of the United Nations or the responsibility of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.

ARTICLE IX

This Treaty shall be ratified by the United States of America and the Republic of China in accordance with their respective constitutional processes and will come into force when instruments of ratification thereof have been exchanged by them at Taipei.

ARTICLE X

This Treaty shall remain in force indefinitely. Either Party may terminate it one year after notice has been given to the other Party.

In witness whereof—

And so forth.

This treaty is still in force.

On February 27, 1972, 3 days ago, or 4 days ago now, Dr. Henry Kissinger, speaking on the record at a formal press conference in Shanghai, China, at the Industrial Exhibition Center Banquet Hall, responded to a question on this subject as follows, and I quote from the formal text of the conference:

Question: Why did not the United States Government affirm its treaty commitment to Taiwan, as the President and you have done on numerous occasions?

Referring to the joint communiqué:

Dr. KISSINGER. Let me take this occasion to deal with that particular aspect, and let me deal with it once, and not answer it in innumerable elliptical forms in which it will be presented.

The particular issue which Mr. Kraslow raised is, of course, an extraordinarily difficult one to discuss on the territory of a

country with which we do not maintain formal diplomatic relations and for which this particular issue is a matter of profound principle.

Let me, therefore, state in response to this and any related question—and let me do it once and not repeat it—we stated our basic position with respect to this issue in the President's World Report in which we say that this treaty will be maintained. Nothing has changed on that position.

But I would appreciate it if that would be all that I would be asked to say about it in these circumstances. But the position of the World Report stands and has been unaltered.

Now, if that was not enough, when President Nixon arrived back from China at Andrews Air Force Base on February 28 at 9:30 in the evening, he said again on the subject of Taiwan, and I quote:

With respect to Taiwan, we stated our established policy that our forces overseas will be reduced gradually as tensions ease, and that our ultimate objective is to withdraw our forces as a peaceful settlement is achieved.

We have agreed that we will not negotiate the fate of other nations behind their backs, and we did not do so in Peking. There were no secret deals of any kind. We have done all this without giving up any United States commitment to any other country.

Mr. Speaker, the Nixon doctrine announced by the President years ago calls for increasing contributions to their own defense on the part of various countries of the world. Of approximately 8,200 U.S. servicemen stationed on Formosa, at this time, more than 6,000 relate exclusively to operations in Vietnam. As those operations are wound down, which President Nixon is massively undertaking, the withdrawal of these troops has nothing to do with support of Taiwan or treaty obligations with Nationalist China. The remaining troops on the island include some 1,500 communications and intelligence-related personnel and 200 advisers and technicians assisting in training Nationalist Chinese forces.

The 7th Fleet remains where it is. The statement that the ultimate resolution of the status of Taiwan in relation to mainland China is for determination by the Chinese, including the Nationalist Government on Taiwan, is merely a reaffirmation of the fact. It is not for the United States to resolve, it is for the Chinese to resolve.

Likewise, U.S. reaffirmation of its interest in a peaceful resolution of this situation is only commonsense and good judgment and nothing new.

Mr. Speaker, it is only if and when a peaceful solution is obtained, which obviously means and includes to the satisfaction of Taiwan, that the U.S. Forces, including fleet operations, will be withdrawn.

Few, if any, Members of Congress have longer been sympathetic and friendly to the cause and frustrations of the Chinese Nationalist Government than myself. I can take that back 25 years when I was secretary to the late distinguished great Senator Styles Bridges in the Senate. I assure you I would be the first to protect any diminution or abrogation of our commitments to Taiwan by any President. These are not only in our interest. They are a matter of our national honor

and are so regarded by the rest of the world.

I did not like the prospect of President Nixon's proposed visit to Communist China. I was concerned by the risks involved, not the least of which extended to the implication that the visit in some manner indicated empathy with a longstanding hostile government at the expense of a government of longstanding friendliness to the United States.

However, I must admit that the President's visit and the manner in which it was conducted and reported, both within and without mainland China, reflected great credit on the President of the United States and the First Lady. The warmth and charm exhibited to tens of millions of peoples can only diminish the propagandized image that heretofore had prevailed in that land of the American President as a devil incarnate. The agreements between Mainland China and the United States resulting from the meeting meaningfully helped to lessen world tensions, all without in any way lessening our commitment to the Nationalist Government on Taiwan. Specifically, the agreement to foster exchanges, to begin and expand a certain amount of trade and to establish a formal point of contact without diplomatic relations reflects the earnest dedication of our American President to seeking a broader basis of understanding between potential aggressors and particularly between the peoples of the world's major hostile powers, and the people of the United States of America.

The repetition of unfounded charges of a sellout of our dependable and valued ally, the Government of Taiwan, only furnishes a basis for further public misunderstanding and helps demagogues in the political stable by lending credence to unfounded accusations of dishonorable conduct on the part of the President of the United States.

I regret and deeply resent that these charges should have been made by a Republican colleague or by anyone else. It is well to remember that throughout all these developments, that President Nixon is also keeping our military guard up and has asked Congress for \$6.3 billion additional for defense procurement in the coming fiscal year.

On the facts, therefore, the charges of a sellout of Taiwan by the President of the United States are totally unjustified.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. I would like to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and compliment him for the very thorough manner in which he has documented the true facts with respect to our relationship to Taiwan. I am one who is pleased with the President's visit to China. I think it is a great step forward in international relations when for once we are at least speaking to people whose very existence we have ignored over the past 22 years. I also consider myself as a staunch friend of the Republic of China on Taiwan.

I think it is important, that the President has in no way taken sides with Na-

tionalist China or mainland China with respect to jurisdiction over Taiwan. He has quite rightly stated that this is a matter for these two nations to settle.

I think it is important to note, too, that the communique renounced force as a means of settling any international issue, and I assume that includes this issue.

I am particularly interested, as a member of the Armed Services Committee who follows military matters very closely, with the allegation, or perhaps it is only an implication, by some people who would rather have an argument and an issue than to have a concrete step toward peace, that this is a sell-out of Taiwan and that we have endangered their military posture.

As the gentleman has so rightly stated, more than 80 percent of American military personnel stationed on the island of Taiwan are directly associated with the U.S. effort in Southeast Asia and will be withdrawn as that effort diminishes. Now, of the remaining 1,700, I would venture my personal opinion that there are not 200 military personnel who are directly associated in an advisory capacity or in any other manner with the military defense of Taiwan. I would go further and state that if all military personnel, were withdrawn tomorrow, the defense of Taiwan would not be degraded by one-tenth of one percent.

Mr. WYMAN. The gentleman is quite right when he speaks about 200 troops over there being actively engaged in training the Nationalist Chinese on Taiwan.

The trouble here, as is so often the case, derives in part from the screaming headlines which appeared in one of the Washington newspapers indicating that the President had committed himself to mainland China and intends to pull American troops out of Taiwan. There is no basis for such headlines.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. Is that not the same newspaper that screams in headlines almost daily about the necessity of our immediately withdrawing 100,000 troops from Southeast Asia who are there for an announced purpose and which at the same time screams against the withdrawal of maybe a couple of hundred men who might be assisting in an advisory capacity in the defense of Taiwan? I think it is about the grossest inconsistency and about the greater example of journalistic hypocrisy that I have ever witnessed, and I have seen some pretty good ones.

Mr. WYMAN. I thank the gentleman for his very kind remarks. The gentleman is a member of the Armed Services Committee. I am a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. It is these frames of reference to which the gentleman has alluded. The distortions are not unique to Washington, but since they now occur in so many places around the country, such distortion tends to cause confusion. I believe it is for those of us who serve on the military committees to try to see not only that the defenses of our Nation are maintained, but

also prudently so, and that the people understand this is being done.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would also like to associate myself with the very direct and forthright statement of the gentleman from New Hampshire, and to state my own conviction that the recent statement by the President prior to his departure from China and upon his arrival in this country does not reflect any sellout of Taiwan and it does not reflect any change in the U.S. policy. As a matter of fact, that statement is entirely consistent with the U.S. policy with respect to Taiwan and our commitments elsewhere around the globe.

The real change in policy was announced on Guam in 1969 when the so-called Nixon doctrine was announced to the world. Prior to that time the pledge had been made by another President that this country would bear any burden, would pay any price, would endure any hardship, would support any friend, and oppose any foe in assuring the survival of liberty.

Pursuant to that policy we tried to become the world's policemen, and we were overcommitted around the world. That policy was changed in the shift announced by the President now known as the Nixon doctrine, and from that time on, the trend has been toward reducing our commitments overseas. The most dramatic evidence of that shift has been in Southeast Asia where the prior escalation of troop commitments has been sharply reversed, and we have seen a steady decline in the level of U.S. forces in Southeast Asia.

The President, with respect to Taiwan, has indicated this will, in effect, continue. Other countries are expected to share the burden of their own defense and assume a greater responsibility for their own defense and development. Our troops will be withdrawn not only from Taiwan, but also from other places in the world as we achieve the peace and stability and reduction of tensions in those parts of the world.

It seems to me this is not only a realistic but also a sensible policy on the part of the President, and he has demonstrated great wisdom and courage and responsibility in announcing it.

Mr. WYMAN. It has to be done. We cannot assume the burden of defense of the free world unilaterally, nor can we avoid our share in it.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like it when people attack the integrity of the President of the United States, be he Republican or Democrat. I particularly find it distasteful when this is done by Republican Members of Congress in the course of a Republican primary campaign.

Such criticism further erodes public confidence in government without just cause. In the same context as charges of a deliberate sellout of Taiwan are charges by another Republican candidate of political deceit by the President. This candidate has published and circulated in New Hampshire at least a paper-

back book allegedly concerned with truth, the cover of which refers to "political deceit in America", the implications being that in some manner the President is a fraud and a party to deliberate deception of the American people.

When this comes from one who calls himself a Republican it can only be interpreted as a part of a broader effort, not just to win a political primary or register a protest vote, but rather to furnish ammunition with which to defeat an incumbent Republican President. A close examination of the allegations indicates their baselessness, but the cumulative effect of innuendo and implications of dishonesty adds to the credibility gap, especially with younger people who are inclined to take such charges at face value. It also, of course, plays into the hands of whomever may be President Nixon's democratic opponent next fall.

Our American President is dedicated to the cause of a generation of peace. I would assume, Mr. Speaker, that on this cause there are no Republicans and no Democrats in this chamber—just Americans. Our President is a devout Quaker. He is a humble man. He is perhaps the most knowledgeable, experienced and capable Chief Executive to hold our highest office in American history. He is not a crook, he is not a fraud, and he does not wilfully misrepresent or deceive the American people.

That he is also Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces under the American Constitution, forces that have been engaged in a war to which his Democratic predecessors committed American forces without a declaration of war from the Congress, includes the prospect that occasionally classification procedures must limit access to information that, if publicized might imperil the lives of men in combat or in the process of withdrawal. This is nothing new. Nor is it deception of the American people. This President is taking us massively out of the tragic involvement in South Vietnam. In so doing, he is living up to his commitment to the American people, but he is not doing it in disarray and he is not doing it with dishonor.

President Nixon has already accomplished much that can lead to a better understanding between nations and a lessening of the possibility of another world war in the nuclear era.

And he is doing this from the vantage point of an individual background that has been demonstrably anti-Communist for decades. He is aware that the resolution of sharply conflicting political philosophies cannot be accomplished over night, and he has cautioned repeatedly against expecting too much from his visit to China or his forthcoming visit to Moscow.

Nevertheless, his efforts at better international understanding, all while keeping America's military guard up and improving our defense capabilities, undeniably reflects the wishes of a majority of concerned American citizens.

President Nixon is no Neville Chamberlain returning from an accommodation with Hitler to proclaim peace in our time. Far from it. His goal, rather, is to dispel in avoidance of confrontation in

war, misunderstandings that can lead to war, one of which might well be that the United States lacks the will to respond to military aggression.

The American people should be profoundly grateful that their President is dedicated to the cause of peace through strength and that he is committed to these major efforts at arriving at working understandings with nations with great military power and vast populations who, if left unattended, might combine to set the stage for a horrible force of aggression upon the United States.

And in the meantime I sincerely hope that throughout the remainder of this year's campaign Republicans, at least, will refrain from continuing or initiating the types of malicious and unfounded criticism of President Nixon that furnish ammunition to whoever may be his opponent in the fall. Deliberate distortions ascribing willful misrepresentation and deceit to the President do precisely this. Perhaps even more unfortunate is the fact that when this course of action appears in printed form it is apparent to all that it is a designed result.

PEACE IN VIETNAM MUST PRECEDE ANY SETTLEMENT OF THE TAIWAN QUESTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss here in somewhat greater detail a point I made this noon in this Chamber in a 1-minute speech with reference to the recent visit of President Nixon to the People's Republic of China.

As a long-time believer in a free China I have been concerned, as have many other Members of Congress, about the full implications of the President's visit and the communique issued at the end of that trip as they bear on the future of the Nationalist Chinese Government on Taiwan.

Like many others I had the initial impression that the communique pulled the rug out from under Taiwan and impaired our existing treaty commitment to work jointly with the Republic of China "to resist armed attack and Communist subversive activities directed from without against their territorial integrity."

In the past few days I have had the opportunity to study the text of the communique and have listened to reports of those who were privately briefed at the White House by the President and Dr. Kissinger after they returned. I have noted the emphatic denials that anything said or done during those meetings has impaired in any way our existing commitments to the Republic of China.

Some of these comments have helped to ease my mind, Mr. Speaker, but not completely. What continues to disturb me after all the explanations and denials are in is that the communique puts us on record as accepting both the principle that "there is but one China and that Taiwan is a part of China," and also one of Mao Tse-tung's five principles of coexistence calling for "noninterven-

tion in the internal affairs of other states."

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, if Taiwan is recognized as a part of China any armed attack or subversive action directed against Taiwan from the mainland would be a strictly "internal" matter, and in accordance with Mao's principle of nonintervention we would be prevented from carrying out our existing commitment under the terms of the defense treaty.

It is true, as administration spokesmen have repeatedly emphasized in recent days, that the commitment about withdrawing troops is highly ambiguous.

All we have really agreed to, they point out, is the withdrawal of "all U.S. forces and military installations from Taiwan" as an "ultimate objective." In the meantime we will reduce our forces and installations on Taiwan only "as the tension in the area diminishes." But a determination of how rapidly the "tension in the area" has diminished lies with us, so we can withdraw our troops, or drag our feet in withdrawing them, in line with any schedule that suits our basic interests.

Of course the most obvious current "tension" in the Pacific area is the war in Vietnam. Most U.S. forces now in Taiwan are not tied to the defense of the Republic of China; they have some pretty sharp forces of their own available for that purpose. Instead, most of our forces are there as part of our supply line to Vietnam. When the Vietnam war ends we will be withdrawing them anyway.

So what we are really saying in the communique, it seems to me, is that if the People's Republic of China wants us to withdraw our forces from Taiwan they had better do something to bring the Vietnam war to an end.

Here, Mr. Speaker, is the quid pro quo that is lacking elsewhere in the communique. Some reports already published have suggested that just such a "secret" agreement exists. I have no inside information of course, but it does make good sense, and could well be the case. And I certainly hope so.

Not only would such an agreement make our new initiative in Peking much more relevant to the current situation, but a Chinese People's Republic that had effectively brought about, let us say, a cease-fire and an Asian peace conference on Vietnam would clearly represent far less a threat to the security of the people on Taiwan.

If such a "secret" agreement does not in fact exist, then I believe it should be our Nation's policy to make clear to Chairman Mao in any future communications we intend to have with his representatives that we will not withdraw all our forces from Taiwan until there has been some such honorable settlement of the Vietnam war. And I would urge the President to make this point completely clear to all the Chinese leaders.

Maybe Mao and Chou cannot pull this off entirely by themselves. But they can do a lot to help. And if they were to do just that we would indeed have moved

a whole lot closer toward real peace in the Pacific.

OBSERVANCE OF 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE: REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE ROGERS C. B. MORTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, last night at a dinner in honor of the 100th anniversary of the National Park Service, the Honorable Rogers C. B. Morton, a former colleague of ours and presently Secretary of the Interior, delivered a stirring address which recaptured for all of us the meaning and importance of the national parks to the population of the United States.

In that address, Secretary Morton reviewed the history of the formation of the Service, but more important I believe, he painted a picture of a Federal agency and a Federal program which has kept up with the times and promises to do so in the future. My good friend the Secretary noted that our park system has grown as the Nation has evolved from a rural society to that of an urban-oriented society. He correctly and quite properly pointed out that the Park Service has had to evolve a management-of-park-visitor philosophy to compliment its natural management-of-natural-resources philosophy. The growth of our society with its attendant problems are felt directly in the Nation's parks: pollution and litter, traffic congestion, and naturally, overcrowding of the visitor population. Secretary Morton did not say that the problems had been licked but that a good beginning had been made.

The Secretary pointed out with justifiable pride the record of this administration in the expansion and improvements in the National Park System. It is an impressive record. There are many of us in the Congress and citizen's throughout the country who wish the record could be even more impressive, but I sincerely believe that, working within the budgetary and priority constraints laid down by the Office of Management and Budget and the Congress itself, the National Park Service is doing a more-than-credible job in keeping up with the growing desire of the population to visit the vast natural and scenic wonderlands that abound throughout this land.

Secretary Morton lauded the founders of our national park system and particularly the personnel who keep our parks visitable. There were and are many people who deserve special credit for our system, but the thrust of the Secretary's speech was a confident and progressive look into the future where he predicted we would, at last, be able to harmonize nature and man.

I heartily recommend the full text of Secretary Morton's speech before the National Park Service centennial dinner. It is a hopeful but realistic appraisal of the past, present, and future of the U.S. Park Service.

The full text follows:

REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR THE HONORABLE ROGERS C. B. MORTON—NATIONAL PARK SERVICE CENTENNIAL DINNER, MARCH 1, 1972

On March 1, 1872 President Grant signed an act of Congress setting aside a tract of land in the Territory of Wyoming as a public park. In the words of that act Yellowstone was established for . . . and I quote . . . "The benefit and enjoyment of the people." It was the first national park . . . not only in America . . . but in the world. Of all the ideas that other nations have copied from us, the most universal has been the emulation of our system of national parks.

In the 100 years since Yellowstone, our park system has grown from one location to more than 280. Its 30 million acres stretch from Alaska to the Virgin Islands. And it offers a rich diversity of experience to millions. . . . The pristine splendor of forest and mountains . . . rivers and deserts . . . in our national parks and national monuments . . . a sense of history and the glory of our past in national shrines like Independence Hall, the Lincoln Memorial and Gettysburg.

The national seashores and lakeshores and other recreation areas offer pleasure and relaxation in surroundings of great natural beauty. And now, a new kind of park . . . Wolf Trap Farm Park, here in greater Washington . . . brings the performing arts to the great outdoors.

As our parks have grown and as our Nation has evolved from a rural society to that of urban metropolitans, population growth and changes in lifestyle have begun to affect the parks. Until recently, the major problems of the parks involved only the management of natural resources. . . . Now they involve management for people . . . and many of them.

During the last decade, park visits have increased many fold to over 200 million annually . . . and they are still going up. This multitude of visitors has brought the same problems to the parks that exist in the cities. . . . Pollution and litter, too many automobiles, over-crowding and the so-called "generation gap" between young people and those in authority.

It is clear to me . . . and to Nat Reed and George Hartzog . . . that the time has come for creative action and bold initiative. I am proud to say that we have made a good beginning.

To solve the problem of the automobile and its pollution, we experimented at Yosemite. The east end of the valley was closed to private automobiles. A free shuttle bus was substituted. In another area of Yosemite, the great Mariposa grove, tourmobiles have replaced private cars.

With the success of the Yosemite experiment, these concepts are being expanded . . . to the Everglades National Park where in the next few weeks the Shark Valley Loop Road will be closed and a tramtrain system will be installed . . . and to Grand Canyon where free shuttle bus services will be inaugurated this summer.

To deal with over-crowding in the back country, we are beginning a new experiment which I have just announced today. We are going to restrict entry to the back country areas of three national parks . . . Rocky Mountain in Colorado, Sequoia-Kings Canyon in California and Great Smoky Mountains in North Carolina and Tennessee. Through a system of permits, we will limit usage of these primitive areas to numbers the fragile environment can accommodate.

To deal with another area of overcrowding . . . in the national park camp grounds . . . we are looking at a computer reservation system for campsites. Such a system would make it easier to limit usage to designed capacity . . . and hopefully it would reduce the number of disappointed campers turned away from full camp grounds on holiday weekends.

Among the crowds that come to the parks today are many more teenagers and young adults than ever came before. They come in search of answers to fundamental questions about their identity and their purpose in life. . . . They seek that special kind of freedom that can be found only in the solitude of the back country. . . . They seek the stability found in nature . . . a stability that is often missing in our rootless, restless urban society.

To give young people a better experience in the parks, we are taking steps to communicate more effectively with them and to develop facilities and programs for their needs. We are establishing better rapport by adding more young rangers to our staffs . . . by making law enforcement more compatible with the park tradition and less visible . . . and providing simple . . . even primitive . . . low cost campsites to meet the demands of young people who want to spurn creature comforts, rock music, rap sessions, ecology talks and walks are now a part of our park programs.

In addition to all of these recent innovations, the park system must be expanded to meet the demand it will experience in its second century. Under the leadership of the President Nixon, we have embarked on an aggressive program to increase the number of parks and to bring them closer to the people.

Through the President, innovative legacy of parks program, some 83 surplus Federal properties have been turned over to State and local governments in 31 States for their own local park and recreation purposes. Grants for new additional national, State, county, and municipal parks are being made available by full funding of the land and water conservation fund at \$300 million annually compared with \$164 million of 4 years ago.

To bring parks within easy reach of millions of inner city people who seldom have the opportunity to visit a national Park, legislation creating two new national recreation areas has been sent to the Congress by President Nixon. They are Gateway East in the New York City-New Jersey Harbor area and Golden Gateway National Recreation Area encompassing the entrance to San Francisco Bay.

(Pause).

As long ago as 1898, the great naturalist, John Muir, eloquently described the need of urban man to experience nature. He said and I quote, "Thousands of tired, nerve-shaken, over-civilized people are beginning to find out that going to the mountains is going home; that wilderness is a necessity; and that mountain parks and reservations are useful, not only as fountains of timber and irrigating rivers, but as fountains of life."

To preserve these "Fountains of life" the President and I are strongly committed to conserving our wilderness and primitive areas. The President has recommended 36 new wilderness areas . . . totalling 3.9 million acres . . . for additions to the wilderness system created by the Wilderness Act of 1964. These are under consideration by the Congress.

We have also requested authority to purchase 547,000 acres of the Big Cypress Swamp in Florida—an area larger than Rhode Island. This will create a fresh water reserve which will protect the water supply of Southwest Florida and preserve the unique and irreplaceable values of the Everglades National Park.

Future generations will probably remember us more for actions like big Cypress than for many of our technical achievements. At this time in our history, we have a rare conservation opportunity in Alaska. I feel especially fortunate and privileged to be Secretary of the Interior at a time when my office is invested with authority from Congress to preserve a substantial and

unique part of America for future generations.

I refer to the authority given me by the Alaska native claims act to set aside up to 80 million acres in this great state. . . . One of the finest natural areas of the world. . . . to set aside this acreage for parks, and forests . . . for wilderness and wildlife refuges. . . . and for wild and scenic rivers. This opportunity to set aside and preserve some of our most precious natural resources is an opportunity that I will not pass by. . . . I promise you that.

The impact of America's great wonderland on the American spirit was beautifully expressed by *Connie Wirth*, immediate past director of the National Park Service when he spoke at the first world conference on National Parks.

He said, "Jefferson saw the qualities of perseverance, independence, and initiative being developed and refined, as the American character was shaped on vast stretches of virgin prairie, beside rolling rivers and in lonely mountain passes. It is in the National Parks that these influences on the United States can be maintained and kept pure, so that this and future generations may know and feel—and benefit from—the same wondrous exposure that our forefathers experienced."

It was this kind of wondrous exposure that motivated Cornelius Hedges when he first explored the territory along the Yellowstone and Firehole Rivers. Cornelius Hedges . . . a man few of us can identify . . . but a man all of us should honor . . . was a judge in the Montana Territory in the late 1800's.

In the fall of 1870, he spent five weeks exploring the Majestic Mountains and picturesque streams of the Wyoming wilderness. And one evening close to the end of his journey . . . sitting around the flickering campfire with his friends . . . amidst tall trees and looming shadows . . . with the rushing sounds of the Firehole River in the background . . . he suggested to his companions that Yellowstone should belong to all Americans. His idealism and his energy fathered the National Park system . . . but he did more than that.

Cornelius Hedges laid the foundation that will help build a second America during the second century of the National Parks and the third century of our Nation.

Today we stand on a new threshold . . . we have the opportunity to build an America in which there is a well-ordered civilization . . . in which there is a balance between the works of man . . . and nature.

In a second America we will no longer allow the environment to pay the price of material progress. We will no longer allow architecture and economics to develop our land like topsy . . . without consideration for the quality of our air and water and the beauty of nature itself.

This simple suggestion by Cornelius Hedges to preserve Yellowstone laid the foundation for a powerful force that after 100 years is spreading through the land. He sowed the seeds of a philosophy whose time has come only now. . . . In the second century of parks. That force and that philosophy is our environmental ethic.

We should all be grateful to Cornelius Hedges for his awareness and his foresight. But we must also be eternally grateful to the many civic minded Americans who have contributed so much to the park service and to the parks themselves.

The high morale and devotion to duty of the men and women of the National Park Service has been inspired by these civic-thinking generous-minded citizens who gave their time and of themselves to the national parks. It has also been inspired by the millions who have visited the parks. All of them love the parks. The people of the park service have been motivated by the magnifi-

cence of their trusteeship—They are locked in a bond of noble purpose.

For me it is a high privilege to serve with them at the beginning of this the 2nd century of our national parks.

All of these people gave us more than they realized. . . . They gave us the spirit which will enable us at last to harmonize nature and man.

I thank you.

FOREIGN AID: BILLIONS IN SEARCH OF A MANDATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, foreign aid is in crisis.

The average American would, if he could, cut foreign aid funds before any other item in the Federal budget. The Congress agonizes over the aid legislation every year and ends up passing it by a handful of votes. Liberals tell us aid will only lead to more Vietnams and conservatives cry about waste and corruption. Study commissions pour forth volumes on what is wrong with the aid program and what should be done to make it work better. Even its supporters put forward an apologetic defense. Confusion, uncertainty and disagreement are the certain hallmarks of any discussion of foreign aid.

And so, the strangest thing of all about aid is that it endures. Since 1947 it has been supported by every President, passed by every Congress, and it has been an important instrument in the foreign policy arsenal of the United States. Aid is always attacked, but always enacted.

A. THE GATHERING STORM

The causes of the current crisis in foreign aid are not hard to perceive. Some have thought aid was a magical cure for the ills of the developing world. Some are frustrated that the vast outpouring of resources by the United States since the end of World War II has not had more tangible results. Some have expected instant development or been misled by the extraordinary success of the Marshall Plan in rebuilding postwar Europe.

Others have been disappointed in the management of the aid programs, pointing to the waste and corruption, or in the failure of the recipient countries to give the United States eternal gratitude and unstinted political support in the arena of world politics. Some are disconcerted because the aid was used merely as a device to promote exports, or gain short term political advantages, or led to greater involvement in the quicksands of the political and economic life of developing nations. Many persons are simply persuaded that serious problems at home deserve more resources.

It is not surprising, then, that the average American sees little value in the large aid program. The total aid package since 1947 has been a staggering \$150 billion worldwide effort, two-thirds of which was economic aid and one-third military, an amazing outpouring of resources from one nation to others.

The storm over aid is apparent from several aspects:

1. DECLINE IN AID LEVELS

The many doubts about the aid program are reflected in sharp reductions in aid appropriations in recent years. In the past 3 years, the U.S. aid program has been cut from \$3.5 billion to \$3.189 billion in fiscal year 1972, while 13 other western states have increased their aid contribution. Thus, the United States, the former leader of donor nations, now ranks at least 12th among world donors on two scales: Aid as a percentage of gross national product and percentage of aid given through multilateral agencies. Aid represents 0.3 percent of our gross national product and only 13 percent of U.S. aid is channeled through multilateral institutions.

2. NARROW MARGINS IN CONGRESS

Another symptom of the aid crisis has been the narrow margins on aid votes in Congress. In the last year, aid has survived on margins of less than five votes in the Senate and not more than fifteen in the House. The increasingly close votes culminated with the November 1971 vote in the Senate to kill foreign aid. Although subsequent action retrieved the program, this symbolic act of discontent with the program should be a catalyst for reform of the program. If the warning is not heeded, even rougher roads may be ahead for aid.

3. ON THE LEFT

The criticism of liberals was articulated by Senator FRANK CHURCH in his October 1971 speech "Farewell to Foreign Aid: A Liberal Takes Leave." In an exaggerated tone, he emphasized that the poor countries were getting poorer, that aid was not aiding and the whole program had become a political instrument to support certain foreign regimes. The liberals' particular gripe has been that so much aid has been military. They contend that economic supporting assistance to unstable, pro-West regimes, particularly in Southeast Asia, led to no real development and only to growing commitments which they now want to reduce. The essence of the liberal critique is that the wrong kind of aid has been going to the wrong kind of government for the wrong kind of reasons. They point to many examples, including Greece, Pakistan, Morocco, Southeast Asia, Ethiopia, and Brazil.

4. ON THE RIGHT

Conservatives also find many evils in the aid program. Aid is seen as a boondoggle, a giveaway by Uncle Santa Claus, a waste, a fraud, and a sham. They see no new friends as a result of aid; indeed, they see only new enemies and increasing ingratitude of recipients. Cuts in foreign aid represent their pique at the world for how they see the world treating the United States. They point to large deficits and the growing debt of this country, and contend that no matter how worthy we simply cannot afford it. They rail against the mushrooming bureaucracy of the Agency for International Development (AID), the multipurposed parent organization that now administers much of foreign aid. With 6,296 employees, this agency is criticized for both bureaucratic ineptness and inertia.

5. VIETNAM

Vietnam is also responsible for the part of the malaise concerning aid on both the right and left. Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT notes former Secretary of State Dean Rusk as saying that:

One of the reasons justifying our involvement in Vietnam was the aid program; . . . the aid bill indicated Congress approved of the climate of intervention in that country.

In the late 1960's, aid became tightly intertwined with Vietnam, and indeed, it is difficult to argue otherwise in light of the Nixon administration coupling of Vietnamization and foreign aid. In aid requests for fiscal year 1972, \$762.2 million of the worldwide \$847 million security supporting assistance program was earmarked for Southeast Asia. Speaking through his Press Secretary, Ronald L. Ziegler, Mr. Nixon publicly contended that his main argument for restoration of the foreign aid program after the November 1971 Senate vote was that without it he could not withdraw from Vietnam as quickly as everyone wished—Christian Science Monitor, November 3, 1971.

Vietnam has, in short, been anything but a typical economic development situation, but it is responsible, more than any other issue, for the crisis in confidence in foreign aid in this country and in our overseas commitments. A lesser recognized tragedy of Vietnam is that successive administrations attempted to use a program designed to assist developing countries achieve orderly growth for conducting a war.

6. GENERAL PUBLIC

The mood of the American people toward foreign aid ranges from apathy to ignorance, to hostility and, in a few cases, to mild support. Few politicians would doubt that it deserves the title of the Government's most unpopular program. Polls in many constituencies show as many as 35 percent opposed to all aid. Such polls also indicate that aid is a low priority item for almost everyone.

7. EXPERTS RESPOND

The search for new directions for aid has been intense partially because the feeling persists that such assistance is at the cross roads: It must either improve or it will cease. Aid is undoubtedly a contender for the most studied program in Government.

The recent decline of both aid and AID, the omnibus agency that has administered many of the foreign aid programs, has come at a time when an increasing number of special commissions with Presidential or international sponsorship have recommended that aid needs to be increased. Internationally, there was the Pearson Commission on International Development, sponsored by the World Bank, a report by the U.N. Committee for Development Planning working toward guidelines for the second U.N. development decade, and the Sir Robert Jackson study of the U.N. Development System.

In the United States, the President's Advisory Committee on Foreign Assistance Problems, chaired by James A. Perkins, the Peterson Presidential Task Force on International Development, which examined a new U.S. approach to

aid for the seventies, and the Rockefeller Presidential Mission for the Western Hemisphere are all officially sponsored attempts to grope with the problem of the future of foreign aid. Several excellent independent studies, especially those of the National Planning Association, usefully add to the U.S. examination of the subject.

The gap between the eager development experts who labored long hours on these prestigious commissions and the doubtful legislators and the apathetic public, however, continues to grow all across the political spectrum. Despite the efforts of many foresighted aid supervisors, the aid crisis is likely to continue and, indeed, increase in intensity unless the program is given a new mandate.

B. WHY AID IS IN OUR NATIONAL INTEREST

With all of this behind us, it is perhaps presumptuous for a single Member of Congress, especially one from rural Indiana, to try to explain why he supports aid. But if the program is to continue and improve, then some of us who vote for it should, amidst all the confusion of purpose about aid, make it plain: why we think the Nation is better off with it than without it. I should advise my colleagues that they will find nothing new or fresh in all this, but merely an effort to pull together reasons to support and suggestions to improve the aid program.

I believe that aid is in the national interest because, if properly used, it can encourage the emergence of a community of nations more compatible with our world view of a community of free, independent, and developing nations. Since so much confusion surrounds aid's purpose, it is also important to state that aid cannot be expected to buy votes in the United Nations, to win political support, or to gain gratitude. If these were our purposes, we would have, and should have, abandoned aid long ago.

I contend that the prospects for the kind of world we want—orderly, stable, cooperative, prosperous and democratic—are better if the United States, the richest country, is solidly behind these goals with a share of its resources, than if the United States refuses to help.

Foreign aid serves as an important instrument of foreign policy. Aid advances the definable economic, security, cultural and social interests, and the moral concerns that the United States has for the welfare of all men. These interests can come together and be advanced by the right kinds of policies toward those countries and peoples who want to develop. Aid, properly conceived, can perform an important function.

There are many important elements in the answers to the persistent question—Foreign Aid: Why? The Pearson Commission groped with this question and concluded that—

The simplest answer . . . is the moral one: that it is only right for those who have to share with those who have not.

Beyond this moral imperative, we do have definable economic, security, and political reasons of national interest for giving aid, as well as definite self-interest motives. Foreign aid has a beneficial im-

pact, both domestically and internationally, and both in security and economic terms. But in delineating important rationales for aid and beneficial objectives of it, we must also seek a realistic program that serves those aims.

These rationales for aid and the objectives they promote need amplification:

1. MORAL REASONS FOR AID

The United States has important moral reasons for giving aid. In brief, we cannot live on an island of affluence in a sea of poverty. We seek to treat the problems of our poor through income redistribution, welfare, progressive taxation and education, and we must be committed to these same issues abroad. The obligation to alleviate suffering exceeds any obstacles of race, creed, or nationality. John Hannah, the Administrator for AID, stresses the U.S. moral role as "the leader in providing assistance." We cannot accept so stark a contrast between the future we ask for ourselves and the future to which others aspire.

By the world's standards, Americans, all of them, are wealthy. Any American of conscience must count himself favored among men for his affluence and feel some obligation to help those less fortunate than he. If he realizes that the average per capita annual income in the United States is over \$3,700, and in the new nation of Bangladesh the equivalent figure is \$75, then he surely feels some responsibility to help. The foreign aid program, with all its problems, is simply an elaboration of that basic and decent impulse.

The West is wealthy and much of its potential production is untouched. The developing countries are poor and, as depressed areas, they cannot develop without help.

The moral impulse of the individual becomes the political imperative for the Government. Since the moral imperative is indivisible, it cannot be applied at home and ignored abroad.

Today, there is broad acceptance of this principle, particularly in West Europe where aid levels are proportionately higher than in the United States.

2. SECURITY INTEREST IN AID

The United States has a security interest in giving aid and in helping channel the modernization and development process away from violence and disruption and toward orderly and constructive change. We have general security interests in reducing tension and conflict anywhere in the world because there is always the danger that violence, even internal disorders, will spill over into international confrontations. As Robert McNamara has demonstrated, there is an indisputable relationship between violence in the world and economic backwardness.

The increasing economic and technological gap between the industrialized and prosperous Northern Hemisphere of "haves" and the largely agricultural and poor Southern Hemisphere of "have nots" will never solve itself without the north seeing a security interest in helping the south. In an interdependent world the United States has a compelling interest in the emergence of a com-

patible and congenial environment of increasingly modernized states. If the countries of the south, where two-thirds of all the peoples of the world live, do not make progress, the chances of disruption and violence will escalate with ominous consequences for all nations.

This security interest is both long run and short run, and it is continuous. While giving aid to particular countries will not necessarily increase the number of our friends in the short run, not giving help when these nations need it will certainly increase open hostility toward the United States. The examples of Egypt and Cuba are cases in point: Were aid given to each at a crucial time, our current relations with each country might be more congenial today. If a developing nation, struggling to survive, knows that the United States is for it, and wants it to succeed, and is willing to encourage it to develop toward self-sufficiency and freedom, that nation will feel more kindly toward the United States, and certainly would be less inclined to act against us. The more nations that possess that kind of an attitude toward the United States, the more secure the United States and the world will be.

The security interest of the United States in assistance should not be exaggerated. Even if the developing countries become frustrated and angry, they pose no threat to the physical security of the United States. But with no foreign aid, these countries could, in the long run, become isolated and hostile which would take the world in the opposite direction of an open and interdependent world and would deny the opportunity for improvement and development to millions of people.

3. MUTUAL ECONOMIC INTEREST IN AID

The United States has a definite stake in the modernization and development processes in poor countries. The alternative to development in these countries is chaos, violence and anarchy.

The development process is underway and it is in our interest to align ourselves with the forces of constructive development around the world. We should assist the process because it is happening. Every developing country has as a major policy goal economic development. The United States is either going to help them make it or ignore them. They will go toward their goal no matter what the United States chooses to do, but they will not forget who helped and who did not when they needed it.

Without economic development of the poor countries of the world, festering tensions between the "haves" and the "have nots" could explode before the end of this century. While the modernization process will not assure a country free from social and political tensions in developing countries, it will enhance political stability and decrease the possibility of hostility.

Foreign aid is also in the economic self-interest of the United States, and prosperity abroad can promote the same here and vice versa. Thus, the impact of aid can have real mutual benefits for donor and recipient. In using aid to purchase goods and services from United

States private companies and institutions, the program not only promotes economic development and creates markets abroad, but it directly serves U.S. enterprises. Surplus agricultural products distributed abroad helps the hard-pressed American farmer. Moreover, the United States is increasingly dependent upon raw materials from the developing world, for example, oil. Although the United States cannot expect many immediate trade opportunities, if economic development is achieved in the developing country, our trade would benefit. The explosive growth of Japan suggests many possibilities for the future.

The benefits accrued to the United States by purchases of American equipment, goods and services by developing countries are impressive:

Aid meant, in 1971, about \$1 billion annual sales for U.S. business;

Between 1964 and 1969, aid money financed between 22 and 30 percent of all cargo shipped on U.S. flag vessels;

Of all aid funds 98 percent for purchase of industrial goods and agricultural commodities is spent in the United States;

Aid meant a net gain of \$300 million on the balance of payment sheet from the investment of \$1.4 billion granted as economic aid last year;

On another level, manufacturers in Indiana received AID-financed orders totaling \$8.7 million between July and December of 1969 and institutions and individuals in Indiana held technical service contracts totaling \$7.4 million as of June 30, 1969.

Aid can promote other United States interests. The United States has many overseas responsibilities which can be helped by constructive aid programs. South Korea is such a special responsibility, and in Africa, Zaire might be another special case. Other self-interest and charitable concerns can be and are served by aid.

In part, because of the above economic interests in aid, the real costs of an aid program are less than the apparent costs, especially when there is substantial excess capacity and unemployment here. Aid, then, not only promotes U.S. security interests, and meets our moral concerns but, because it advances our economic interests, too, its costs are not as great as initially appears.

The utility of aid for the United States can be even greater if it is used as an attribute of the world system of power. Big, important developing countries, rich in resources, and with a tendency for world role-playing can be a useful place for United States concessions in the form of aid, investment or trade. Nigeria, Ghana, India, Indonesia, and Iran are good examples.

4. INTEREST IN SOCIAL AND POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

The United States also has an important interest in seeing that common people in all developing countries come into fuller participation in the private and public decisionmaking processes of their countries. Since we believe in democracy, we want the ideals of democracy to spread. We believe the world will be safer

and a better place to live if people have a voice in the decisions that affect the quality of their lives, and an opportunity to participate in the development of their country and its resources, and if they see and share in the benefits of that development.

The foreign aid program, then, becomes, at best, an instrument for the spread of fundamental conditions which enhance the development of all men. The world will look more kindly upon us if we share in man's struggle for these conditions.

C. AID PROBLEMS

The compelling arguments for AID that can be marshaled today should not detract from the many problems of the entire program. The fact that there are several good rationales for AID and that AID serves domestic and international objectives of the United States should not prevent us from acknowledging the problem areas of the AID programs and seeking remedies to them.

1. EFFECTIVENESS

Perhaps the most telling criticism of AID is that it has not been effective. Although AID represents only a small portion of the total income of developing countries, it has supplied the critical margin of investment and import financing so important to development. It has also improved the infrastructure for development in scores of countries; with machinery, parts, harbors, railways, roads, and communications. It has financed the "green revolution," contributed to the transfer of technology, encouraged planning, increased school enrollment, improved public health, and stimulated change.

Although there are not certain measurements on this, the mixed results of development during the 1960's suggest, according to the Pearson Commission, that the correlation between aid and growth is weak. According to the commission, the average rate of increase in the gross national product of developing countries in the 1960's was a respectable 5 percent per annum, but the high rate of population growth held down rates of increase in income per head to about 2.5 percent per year. Global contrasts are equally revealing, so some aid successes stand besides vast areas of economic, social, and political stagnation. All serious students of developmental aid agree that assistance can make a difference between stagnation and growth for a developing country. Nonetheless, there are problem areas, and we must try to solve them.

While the many panels convened to discuss aid vary in focus and emphasis, they all acknowledge some world progress because of aid but see the need for a lot more. They stress the magnitude of the problems of development and sustaining growth, the interaction of economic, political, and social change and the disparities of achievement and performance. The thought-provoking criticisms of all reports do raise serious questions concerning the whole aid program, but it is significant that all their talk is not about cutting aid or withdrawing from aid ventures but about recasting, reorganizing, and revitalizing it.

2. WASTE AND INEFFICIENCY

Many of aid's detractors point to the waste of the program. For every success story, as in South Korea, Taiwan, or Iran and programs like the Rice Institute in the Philippines, there is a horror story: A 21st century airport in Kandahar, Afghanistan, with one incoming flight a day or a museum of birth control devices in a small Asian country or a softwood mill in Iran supplied with hardwood cutting equipment from the United States.

Without doubt, there has been some waste in the program. In an enterprise so vast, with 15 or more countries transferring over \$6 billion in goods and sources to over 80 developing countries in the undeveloped techniques of developmental assistance, mistakes are bound to happen. The inherent difficulties of development, the bureaucratic inertia and ineptness, corruption, all contribute to the problems of waste.

Waste and inefficiency not only infect many programs in developing countries and feast on clashes between AID and officials in recipient countries, but they exist in the lending agency itself. A frequent and justifiable complaint concerns the overstaffing of aid overseas despite recent progress. In one African country, for instance, there are two AID administrators for every three men in the field, while one Scandinavian country with a similar program in the same country has one administrator for nine men in the field. Brazil was once an often cited sham in AID overstaffing. In addition, some AID personnel is of poor quality. Many inflexible technicians have difficulty relating to the aspirations and needs of citizens in recipient countries.

Procedure must be constantly monitored to reduce waste, but the view of the many auditors who have examined the program is that the waste is not excessive, and certainly not high enough to make the aid effort not worthwhile. Recognition of the waste, however, should not detract at all from the AID successes that have been free of large-scale waste. We must expect some waste because developing countries, by definition, have limited trained manpower and mistakes are going to be made. The charge that aid is wasted recklessly simply is not warranted in view of the record.

3. AID SAVES STATUS QUO OR REPRESSIVE REGIMES?

Another problem confronting the program has been the criticism that aid often entrenches a government opposed to fundamental reform, and enhances the power of autocratic and repressive governments. Precisely because some supporters of aid want the program designed to help create a compatible and congenial world, they oppose large amounts of aid for countries who have leaders who rule by denying basic liberties, who revere the status quo or who have no real commitment to economic, political, and social development or free institutions. Countries where army officers clubs become parliaments and politics smacks of musical chair generals are not places where the leadership seeks to transform the status quo or to intro-

duce effective, participatory institutions. Greece and Brazil are two examples cited despite economic growth in those two countries in recent years.

Strong, repressive governments which equate debate or challenge with treason are not likely to promote the kind of development we seek. Aid for these governments is likely to be counterproductive in the long run. It may "shore up" some supposedly friendly state for the short run, but it is unlikely to promote any long-run growth or stability, and it certainly does not contribute to the kind of world order we seek.

4. AID AND OVERSEAS COMMITMENTS

Another problem of the aid program is that it sometimes leads to commitments. It is easy to initiate programs and hard to end them, easy to take on commitments and hard to dispose of them.

Aid to a country can become a reason for itself, and for protecting our investments. In many cases, large aid projects to a particular country do lead to important commitments, and once the commitment exists, members of the executive argue that the economic cost of continuing the commitment is far less than the political costs of ending it. The fact that only a handful of countries have become aid graduates once the program commenced—Taiwan, Korea, and Iran, to name a few—reinforces the theory that aid makes and strengthens overseas commitments.

Vietnam and Southeast Asia have become symbolic of the U.S. aid-commitment trinity. The growth of a vaguely conceived, small aid program that mushroomed into a fighting force of well over half a million men is part of the agony of Vietnam.

5. CONTINUITY OF PROGRAM

Since World War II, there have been many changes in the concepts and execution of aid projects. The leadership of the various agencies who have administered aid, most recently AID, has changed so much that the program has lacked any sense of continuity. John Montgomery has summarized the history of the past two decades in the International Development Review:

Most foreign aid doctrines in the past have been the result of waves of sentiment, fads in economics and social science, and accidents of leadership. Point Four programs reflected as much the personality of Henry Garland Bennett as they did post-war economics or the needs of the less-developed countries. Later phases have concentrated on bankers' approaches, or led to domination of programs by auditors and accountants, or turned to multilateralism as an escape from politics, or invented institution-building as an approach to technical assistance, or discovered macroeconomics as a means of justifying resource allocations. Some of these phases represent flashy new ideas, official discoveries of appealing old ones, or Congressional pressures for reforms. One of the great tragedies . . . has been the lack of continuity in programs and theories, coupled with a failure to place foremost a thoughtful examination of the processes and the results of foreign aid activities.

Congress has also affected the continuity of the aid program. With its understandable desire to keep an eye on aid programs, Congress, in fact, complicates

the aid effort by demanding yearly authorizations.

D. TOWARD AN EFFECTIVE AID PROGRAM

The current debate over foreign aid, the plethora of literature on the topic, and the many calls for reform must be seen in some perspective. Foreign aid is only one useful instrument of foreign policy and it can accomplish only limited results. Through military aid, loans and grants, food for peace, technical assistance, population control aid, trade, private investment, humanitarian and refugee relief programs, cultural exchanges, information programs, and education, health and agricultural aid, some of the goals of the United States can be pursued. For foreign aid to be effective, all these programs should be orchestrated to achieve maximum impact.

The United States has a limited capability to affect significantly the development of other countries. At best, foreign assistance can only supply a critical margin of developmental assistance. The crucial factor, not under United States control, is the determination of the developing country to work toward development.

The U.S. interest in aid should not be overstated. Short run economic and political benefits of aid are normally modest and while long run material gains from aid may be important, they are also uncertain. Foreign aid as a tool of policy may contribute to this Nation's commercial and political interests, but aid offers no panacea for the world's problems.

Recognition of the limited, tangible benefits of aid puts the whole program in perspective and leads to a more serious and realistic debate over what aid can and cannot accomplish.

The aid program will never automatically yield votes in the United Nations, or easily create friends, or encourage others to adopt U.S. institutions, practices or culture, or really insure political stability.

A realistic perspective on the value of aid also includes recognition that an appropriate time frame for the success of development aid is not a year or two, but a decade or two. Development is no sport for the shortwinded. Program continuity is essential to make the aid effort effective.

Such a perspective also includes an appreciation, if not an understanding, of the complexities of the developmental process. Few tasks are more difficult than nation building.

Several modifications in the aid program are necessary to deal with the specific problems with the program, already discussed, and will help produce an effective aid effort by the United States.

1. EMERGENCY AID

The United States should have a strong, separate emergency aid program, designed to deal quickly and effectively in providing humanitarian and disaster relief in the wake of crises. World crises cannot wait for appropriations. Through a separate emergency program, the United States would be better able to support the pressing immediate needs of the world's 20 million refugees and

those who suffer from war, disease, and disaster.

2. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

A major thrust of our assistance should be technical assistance, including individual experts and also the creation of institutions to support them. The United States must not be indifferent to the population explosion and its effect on development. Population problems must be given the highest priority in planning for effective aid programs. Agriculture, education, and health should also receive strong emphasis in our assistance programs.

3. BILATERAL AID

Bilateral aid should be used for specific foreign policy objectives in selected countries. The United States will always have a special interest in the economic development of specific countries and the bilateral aid program should serve that purpose. Colombia, Zaire, and Thailand might be examples. It should be used as a relatively precise foreign policy tool, separately considered from the United States' broad interest in the economic development of all countries, and separately administered by the Department of State. Many of the traditional supporters of aid have rejected bilateral aid in favor of multilateral aid. But bilateral aid has its uses, and the choice between bilateral and multilateral aid need not be mutually exclusive. A small bilateral aid program, tightly constructed and selective in approach will make aid more effective.

4. PREREQUISITES OF AID

The United States might, in its bilateral aid program, usefully focus on a limited number of countries which meet certain prerequisites. First, this aid should focus on countries which place highest priority on economic development, the spreading of political power, and the sharing of benefits with all the people of the country. If countries are not interested in these goals, then, with the possibility of only a few exceptions, U.S. aid should not be extended. In such a bilateral program, we would greatly reduce the amount of aid going to status quo oriented government, often known for repressive tactics, thereby meeting one major criticism of the current aid program.

Other prerequisites of aid might be:

The economic performance of a country and the commitment of its leadership to economic and social change and development;

The security relevance of the recipient country to the United States;

The extent, of and commitments to, diversified decisionmaking processes and participatory institutions in the political system;

The global importance of the country to receive aid; and

The existence of a historical or cultural tie to the United States.

The United States, thus, must pay closer attention to the kinds of countries receiving aid. If there ought to be requirements of aid recipients, they should make aid contingent on local willingness and ability to use aid effectively and on a commitment to modernization

and social and political development. These tough requirements can correct many of the criticisms of the aid program.

Economic development and growth take time, painstaking work and sacrifice with few measurable results in a short time reference. Thus, the limited, but valuable, contribution that aid can make to development must be evaluated along with the strength of the commitment of a poor country to economic development. A realization of both can, in many countries, permit aid to promote real development. In the final analysis, the real test of aid is whether countries are enlarging their own resources, relying less on grants and loans and more on self-help, thereby reducing, over the long run, the U.S. commitments overseas.

The United States should not hesitate to use its aid to promote its objectives. We believe that our democratic institutions have validity for others as well as for ourselves. We want to promote diversity and pluralism in societies and aid should be used to promote these objectives. To accomplish this objective, a strong private sector with indigenous roots needs to be a major concern of aid, and it should be used to develop unions, cooperatives, independent academic institutions and professional groups.

5. MULTILATERAL AID

Along with the bilateral aid program should be a multilateral aid program used to promote economic development throughout the developing world. It should be a major goal of the United States to strengthen the multilateral aid organizations.

Multilateral aid has many benefits: It can avoid foreign commitments for the United States; self-help requirements of aid can be applied better; it insulates the United States from domestic entanglements in the recipient country; it gives recipient countries a greater flexibility of operations; it encourages more central planning and gives the aid effort continuity; and it can help a country diversify its development strategy. Multilateral aid can both increase the effectiveness of aid and decrease its waste and inefficiency.

International agencies could usefully be the conveyor of a larger share of U.S. general economic aid to the majority of developing countries with differing economic problems and in need of differing development strategies. These agencies, in particular the increased number of international banks, are better equipped to deal with the general development needs of a Chad and Mauritius or an Indonesia and Morocco. Such multilateral aid should emphasize agricultural development, population planning and technical assistance. The Peterson Commission called for doubling the current level of U.S. multilateral aid to \$1 billion. Such a goal is realistic for the present.

The U.S. relationship to these multilateral aid agencies should be spelled out. The United States should not try to dominate such international organizations, and it must be careful not to contribute such a large share of the budget that such organizations lose their international character. Rather, the United

States should coordinate our aid approach carefully with all multinational institutions, and through these organizations encourage more research about the development process.

6. LEVEL OF AID

Many experts focus on the level of aid as an important question to resolve. Some argue that the present aid level of an average of 0.39 percent of GNP in donor countries is woefully inadequate, and others argue for aid levels representing 1 percent of GNP. The U.S. percentage has decreased from 2 percent of GNP in 1949 to half of 1 percent in 1968-69. The Pearson Commission urged a 0.70-percent annual level by 1975.

But a far more relevant question than the gross amount or volume of aid is a consideration of the ability of specific countries to use the aid effectively.

7. ENCOURAGING PRIVATE INVESTMENT

The United States should also encourage the use of more private investment to help develop pluralism in countries undergoing modernization. Such private investment has too many mutual economic benefits for developing countries and the United States not to be encouraged.

Private foreign investment is now encouraged through organizations like the Overseas Private Investment Corporation—OPIC. But more must be done than to try to insure U.S. companies against the risks of nationalization and expropriation. With the right labor policies in developing countries and with the companies' willingness to dovetail with recipient countries' planning strategy, there is much more room for private investment designed to help countries develop their resources.

The developing countries have the primary responsibility to create a climate conducive to private investment, but the United States could also do more to strengthen the chances of investment, including investment tax credits, guarantees, investment surveys, and distribution of information on investment opportunities.

As important as private aid is, it will not serve as a substitute for public aid programs. Public aid for schools, hospitals, roads, and the entire infrastructure of a nation is necessary to attract private assistance.

8. REDUCING THE COSTS OF AID TO RECIPIENT COUNTRIES

One of the common features of developing countries is mounting debts. Debt servicing should be a recognized type of aid. Debt rearrangements are often necessary, and the United States should also take into full account this debt servicing problem when the terms of development loans are made.

Because so much of aid given is tied to the use and purchase of American goods and services—now over 90 percent of the total—the real benefits of aid to some countries are reduced by the requirement to purchase more expensive goods.

The United States should proceed with the progressive untying of aid and look elsewhere for ways to solve our balance of payments problems. For example, other policy changes, particularly

in the area of trade and encouragement of private investment, might promote the very growth and development sought.

9. MILITARY AID

Military and security supporting assistance must be separated from development assistance, and administered by the Department of Defense. Programs with separate purposes can best be administered separately. To improve the military security in a few selected countries is an important objective of the United States, but the continued confusing of supporting assistance to the economies of nations for military objectives with aid for strict economic development is detrimental to the whole aid effort. Economic supporting assistance has not been nearly as effective as technical economic assistance in promoting growth. The separation of the two will aid the achievement of the objectives of both.

10. FOCUS OF SECURITY ASSISTANCE

Like the bilateral program, security assistance should focus on only select countries where the United States has security interests. Since the Marshall Plan, military security has been the primary public justification for U.S. foreign aid but our military security does not in the sense of every attack or conquest, depend, in any large sense, on what happens or does not happen in developing countries.

A limited program of security assistance to select developing countries would focus on countries where there was an eagerness for and a commitment to economic development that was seriously threatened by external forces. If the United States has a fundamental interest in a congenial and compatible world, it has a commitment to those nations which are committed to the same goals, which want to help themselves, and which occupy advanced positions.

11. PROGRAM REORGANIZATION

The U.S. aid program needs organizational reform. Along with the dire need for a revitalization of the overall aid program, a clear aid strategy and a recasting of the programs' images, there is a need for reorganization. The subtle shift in emphasis in the 1960's from the Agency for International Development to aid, from bilateral to multilateral aid efforts, from AID implementation of security assistance to its being handled by other institutions, confirms a decline in the importance of the omnibus Foreign Assistance Act and the multipurposed economic assistance agency. The very diversification of U.S. goals in world politics and the increase in the variety of means available for achieving aims suggests the end of AID is near. Thus, in some respects, the abolition of the omnibus agency, is only reflecting realities in the same way reform and changes in the international financial rules of the game.

Samuel Huntington, a Harvard University professor of political science, suggests that the abolition of AID and the existing Foreign Assistance Act would serve as a useful first step in the disaggregation of aid, a process which would help identify what goals aid may

serve and to what extent these goals can be justified. I suggest the creation of a new aid process which would try to focus attention on the goals of policy rather than one means of policy implementation—foreign aid.

In this way, goals can be delineated, priorities ordered, responsibilities vested, and appropriate means determined. Four goals have been mentioned: the strengthening of the military security of select countries; the economic development of the poor countries of the third world; the promotion of development in specific countries where the United States has special interests; and the encouragement of the emergence of pluralistic societies and social development.

Aid has been difficult to administer partly because it has had so many purposes. Disaggregation should give it clearer purposes, clearer organizational lines and greater coherence and continuity. The awkward procedures of aid programs are legendary, and stand in the way of effective programs. These procedural obstacles should be identified and removed.

The organizational reforms must recognize the necessity of extending aid in close cooperation with the host country and with full coordination with other donors. Coordinated country programs is required for maximum developmental impact with limited resources.

12. NEED FOR CONTINUITY AND CLEAR STRATEGY

Finally, along with the need for the reorganization of the aid program, there is related need for the program to have both continuity and a clear strategy, so that the program transcends administrations and administrators. The major objective of aid should be economic development. While there is no common approach to aid and development, greater coordination with international groups and planning of our own aid program will definitely give more continuity and purpose to aid efforts, and such continuity will, in turn, produce a more effective aid program. To help achieve continuity, the appropriation period should be extended. If recipient countries do not have assurance of approximate aid levels for several years at a time, planning and effective implementation are impossible.

TOWARD POPULAR ACCEPTANCE

Improving the aid program in the manner suggested here is the best way to gain support for our aid program. Such a reorganized, selective effort depending on certain standards of performance by recipient countries and with assurances that the program will eventually be phased out will go far to eliminate many of the existing aid problems—lack of effectiveness, waste, inefficiency, increasing overseas commitments, and support of unpopular and undemocratic governments.

However, popular acceptance of a foreign aid project will be dependent on more than a clear strategy and better organization and continuity. There is no magic formula on the horizon, and it is not likely that one will emerge. As both President Nixon and the Congress have

rightfully made clear in recent months, the United States urgently needs a new approach to the developing countries, one more suited to the realities of the 1970's than the tensions of the cold war.

In the first instance, popular acceptance of foreign aid in the 1970's will depend on a strong leadership which can sell the program to a doubting Congress and an apathetic public. This means several things: Most important, it demands a forceful Presidential leadership and the enunciation of a clear strategy by the Secretary of State. President Nixon is a moderate on aid, reflecting the thinking of many Members of Congress, but too often in the last 4 years, his aid program has come across as an appeal to save his Vietnamization policy. If the President focuses on aid, he can sell it to the Congress and the general public.

In the second instance, it will depend on a Congress which accepts that Presidential challenge. John F. Kennedy once observed that no politician ever lost an election because he or she voted for foreign aid. That may be true, but it is also true that most Members of Congress find it more convenient in most any assembly to talk about something other than foreign aid. Congress shares with the President an objective to provide leadership in support of aid.

In the third instance, popular acceptance of aid will depend on a private sector committed to this foreign policy instrument and desirous of a role in it. There are now a few private groups supporting aid, but with strong Presidential and congressional backing, many leaders in the private sector can make substantial contributions to the development of a broader understanding of why aid is in this country's national interest.

This Nation has an important stake in the realization of free, independent, and developing nations. The average American understands that stake and he will be willing to support an effective program of moderate size to help achieve it.

If a program is developed with the general characteristics suggested here, the chances for the realization of a more compatible and congenial world order will be enhanced.

ASPIN REQUESTS BOMBING STATISTICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, Representative MICHAEL HARRINGTON and I have called upon Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird to provide the public with more useful and comprehensive information about American bombing in Indochina.

As members of the Armed Services Committee and Members of the Congress, we have both a right and obligation to explain to our constituents and the American people what our Government's policy is. It is impossible to evaluate the Vietnamization program adequately and relate our evaluation to the American people without full public disclosure of the bombing in Indochina. Reports

should be provided on a weekly or bi-weekly basis giving tonnage rates and sortie rates over each individual country in Southeast Asia. Information differentiating bombing tonnage and sorties over Northern Laos and the Ho Chi Minh trail should also be provided.

The truth about the nature and extent of bombing in Indochina is consciously being hidden from the American people by the Pentagon. The indiscriminate use of air power in Indochina has cost countless lives and ecological disruption throughout Indochina. The American people have a right to the truth, so that they can properly study and evaluate the success or failure of the Vietnamization process.

Pentagon spokesmen have told the media that the information that we seek is too difficult to compile. That is absurd, if the Pentagon can afford to mount a massive bombing campaign in Southeast Asia, it can afford to accurately inform the American people about the results of those policies.

For months, in the press, there have been warnings of an impending offensive in Vietnam that never seems to materialize. So far, Pentagon spokesmen claim that American bombing has successfully quelled, at least for the moment, the projected offensive by the Vietcong and North Vietnamese. Without complete information, neither Members of Congress nor the public can judge whether our continued massive bombing crushed the enemy's much-publicized offensive or not.

The days of whitewashing must stop. The days of truth in government should begin. An excellent place to start would be providing Members of Congress and the public complete, accurate, and comprehensive information about the bombing of Indochina. Our letter to Secretary of Defense Laird follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. MELVIN LAIRD,
Secretary of Defense, Pentagon, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As members of the House Armed Services Committee charged with the responsibility of voting on the military budget, we are writing to ask you for information which is essential to the effective performance of our duties.

The major burden of the American military effort in Southeast Asia is the air war in South and North Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. By any standard, the massive bombing conducted by American forces in these countries represents a major military effort. Yet we are unable to obtain useful, comprehensive information about this activity.

Bombing figures released to the public consist solely of a monthly total for all four countries, and that total is not released until more than forty days after the close of the month which it covers. This is wholly inadequate for any rational purpose. To permit intelligent analysis, bomb totals must be made available on a weekly or at most a bi-weekly basis, broken down according to the country involved. And the figure must include not merely the tonnage of bombs dropped, but the number of sorties flown.

The rationale for American policy in southeast Asia depends heavily on the claims made for the bombing policy. While we are vigorously opposed to that policy, and believe

strongly that a date should be set immediately for prompt, secure withdrawal of all military forces from Indochina, we are none the less interested in evaluating vietnamization on its own terms. And that is simply impossible to do with the current restrictive information policy.

For example, no clear estimate can be formulated of the chances of success of the Cambodian or Laotian Governments in their current military activities without knowledge of the range of bombing activity in which we are engaging in these countries. Have recent military reverses for these governments been accompanied by an increase in American support bombing? If so, are we then committed to an increased military role in Cambodia and Laos as long as their own military forces continue to suffer defeats?

Similar questions apply in Vietnam. Are casualty rates closely correlated to our bombing activity? Do decreases in American bombing result in increases in North Vietnamese and Viet Cong military actions?

If so, does this further indicate that our commitment to an escalated military role is open-ended, and that the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong forces have the ability to trigger future American military action as they see fit?

Moreover, as members of Congress, we have a direct interest in the financial aspects of this policy. The air war is clearly one of the major items in the military budget at present, involving multibillion dollar expenditures. Yet we cannot find out where the bombs are falling, at what rate, and to what purpose. In these circumstances it is impossible to make reasoned choices among competing budgetary requests.

We recognize that security considerations are involved, and while we oppose the policy of continued bombing, in no way would we want to do anything that would endanger any of our servicemen. But since we are not asking to be informed about prospective bombing missions, but only for cumulative totals of missions that have already taken place, we see no basis whatever for invoking security as a reason for denying our request. Presumably, once bombs have been dropped, it is no longer a secret to the people who have been bombed, and we find it unthinkable that the American people should know less about past military activity of their government than the victims of that activity.

We have read newspaper accounts of DOD spokesmen arguing that the information we seek is impossible to compile, but we cannot accept this as a justification for refusing our request. If it is true that the Defense Department and the individual services do not in fact know the extent of bombing activity in which they have engaged in a given country in a given week, that is surely a condition which must immediately be corrected. It is certainly hard to square such professions of ignorance with claims that the air war is being carefully and scientifically controlled to produce maximum military results with minimum loss of life. How can you know the effects of your bombing activity if you do not know with any clarity how many bombs you dropped, and on what country you have dropped them?

We hope you will agree that full information for Congress and the public is an important goal.

Very truly yours,

MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON.
LES ASPIN.

CHAIRMAN MILLS DISCUSSES TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, this week's issue of Business Week magazine contains an interesting interview with the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, WILBUR MILLS.

Chairman MILLS' review of the complex and demanding issues facing his committee this session contains abundant good sense. I was especially impressed by his remarks on capital gains and estate and gift taxes.

Of capital gains, Chairman MILLS said:

It's pretty hard to justify treating a capital gain differently from ordinary income. I've never felt there is anything more sacrosanct about the profit from the sale of an asset than from the sweat of your brow.

He also discussed some of the problem areas in the estate and gift tax system:

One thing that disturbs people is the relationship between the rates on gift and estate taxes. Another is whether we should continue to let an individual give away everything he has at death and avoid taxes on any of it.

I commend Chairman MILLS' remarks to our colleagues:

CANDIDATE MILLS TALKS TAXES

No one in Washington has more influence over taxes, trade, Social Security, health care, or welfare than Wilbur D. Mills, 62-year-old chairman of the House Ways & Means Committee. He is used to being courted by Presidents who are pushing legislation in these areas. Now, undaunted by low poll readings and a large field of rivals, Mills is seeking the Presidency himself.

In a Business Week interview, Mills spoke of a variety of major economic issues. Most important perhaps, Candidate Mills gave some insights into the thinking of Chairman Mills on future tax legislation.

Q. Do you see a "taxpayers' revolt" brewing against the property tax?

MILLS. Yes, I think one might describe it as the beginning of a revolt. I've been to a number of states and found the assessments to vary all over the lot. In some states the charges are excessively high.

I was told in Newark, N.J., that one would pay almost \$1,900 a year property tax on a \$20,000 home. That's a pretty severe jolt, especially to someone who's retired. I'm told some people are just turning their homes over to the mayor—just leaving the keys. Local governments feel they've reached the breaking point on the property tax.

Q. Would you agree with President Nixon that this is "one of the most oppressive and discriminatory of all taxes"?

Well, there's nothing more regressive than property taxes. Sales taxes are probably second. I don't know what he means by discriminatory unless he means the different treatment accorded the tax in difficult states. Should the federal government take the lead in trying to cut this tax?

The state governments can't do it, apparently. I don't know whether the federal government can, but it's the only place the property owner can look to for relief.

What is the possibility of Washington doing something about it?

I think if the Supreme Court sustains these school financing cases like the one in California, it might be necessary for the federal government to get into the costs of education to a much greater extent to eliminate discrimination in payments per child.

NEW SOURCES OF REVENUE

Since the property tax raises about \$20-billion just for support of schools, must we turn to new revenues, such as the value-added tax?

It might be. I have not been an advocate

of VAT at any time. I've said all along it's a regressive tax, nothing more than an ordinary sales tax, except it pyramids where a sales tax doesn't.

Wouldn't this just be swapping one regressive tax for another?

No question about it. But I'm not ready to say yet that one is worse than the other. If you have a lot of exemptions and rebates, then the first thing you know you've got to have an exceedingly high tax rate in order to develop the kind of revenues you want. If VAT were used to reduce property taxes, then I'd have to back off from my initial and basic opposition to it. I'd have to weigh which is the more onerous, the more regressive.

Do you think VAT can get through Congress if the President proposes it?

I have no idea. It won't be proposed this year in all probability. Perhaps next year.

Are there any alternatives for helping property owners, other than VAT?

The income tax itself could be raised, but you'd have as much objection to that as to VAT. Probably more.

What about closing loopholes?

That's an exaggerated problem. Take the recent disclosure that some people with \$200,000 income weren't paying any taxes. In many instances, on further audit of their returns they'll be assessed a tax. It looks to us that in some cases they've overlooked the 10% minimum tax on income not subject to regular rates.

Might you move in the future to increase that minimum tax?

There's always the possibility any time you levy a tax that it will go up.

DEGREES OF PREFERENCE

What's the next big loophole we ought to close?

I frankly don't know. Everybody talks about the depletion allowance. But historically the Congress has felt that some degree of preference is necessary if we don't want to be dependent on the production of oil, gas, and other minerals outside the U.S. Some people want to end the preferences altogether, but what would that do to these industries? That's the question. I'd like to see an income tax law where all income is treated alike, regardless of the source. But that's utopia.

How about capital gains taxes?

It's pretty hard to justify treating a capital gain differently from ordinary income. I've never felt there is anything more sacrosanct about the profit from the sale of an asset than from the sweat of your brow. But if people had to pay regular tax rates on capital gains, they'd never sell. You'd freeze them in their present assets.

Payroll taxes have been rising pretty rapidly—250% since 1965. Can you send them much higher?

Actually, the Social Security taxes may develop far more revenue over the next years through this century than it would be advisable for us to raise—and beyond our needs. Some predictions of the revenue in the trust fund lead me to believe that we may have those taxes higher than they should be. We might be able to increase benefits and reduce taxes at the same time. [At midweek, Mills introduced legislation to increase benefits 20% across the board, instead of the 5% called for in a bill now before the Senate Finance Committee].

Would you dip into general revenues some day for Social Security?

No, I don't want to do that. We're already putting some general funds into Social Security for medicare and medicaid. But once you tap the Treasury for Social Security benefits, it becomes too easy to keep doing it. I don't think the general funds could bear that burden.

As it is, we don't have any room out there for new programs. If you look down the road, the \$246-billion we're paying in fiscal 1973

for federal government services will be costing us \$300-billion in a very short time.

Will it be necessary to raise income taxes in the next year or two?

I don't know. First thing I would do if I were running this show would be to find out if we could not hold the cost of government to much lower levels of increase than take place now. The spending increases are exceeding the revenue increases by far.

How can you, as a fiscal conservative, go along with huge deficits?

I can't go along with deficits of the current size. But I couldn't argue for a balanced budget; it would be too much of a depressant.

Can Congress cut spending?

Congress won't do it; it has lost control. There's so much already in the pipeline, and the President decides how much will actually be spent.

If we do keep increasing aid for education, mass transit, and the rest, won't we have to turn to new revenue sources? Where would you turn?

The income tax is where you would turn if you needed more revenue. But what I'm saying is that I hope we can avoid that by holding the line on spending. We required President Johnson to reduce the budget early in his Administration, you remember.

ON REVENUE SHARING

Do you expect to get some revenue sharing legislation out this year?

Yes, I expect to get something out in March. Now let me make it quite clear. The bill I introduced is not my bill in the sense that I developed it. It was developed by the technicians working with our staff, the league of cities, governors' staffs. I asked them to get together, get a bill that eliminated the objections I had to the President's revenue sharing proposal. I said I would introduce the bill, though some amendments might be made.

I'm going to offer some. One will be to establish priorities for the \$1.8-billion we give the states just as we do for the \$305-billion that goes to the cities. The other would change the provision that denies assistance to any state that doesn't have an income tax law. I'm too much of a states-righter to do that. Nevertheless, the way it works out, a state with an income tax would still get a bigger share of the federal money.

Do you expect to pass a health insurance program this year?

The committee will go into executive session on health care right after we finish with revenue sharing. That would be mid-March at the earliest.

Do you expect to write a comprehensive health care bill or just something on catastrophic illness?

I would like to write a comprehensive program this year, but only time will tell whether we can. There are a lot of problems to be studied.

What do you think of the President's proposals for requiring vesting of pension rights and increasing the tax deduction for purchase of private retirement plans from \$2,500 to \$7,500?

I would favor vesting of these rights, and at an earlier date. As for the \$2,500 deduction for an individual's own retirement plan, that's entirely inadequate. I'm not saying \$7,500 is ideal, but \$2,500 is too low.

Is this something Ways & Means might get at this year?

I doubt we'll get a bill from the President this year, and on a matter of this sort we ought to wait until we get the benefit of the thinking at the Treasury. Our own staff people have not completed their work on it yet.

Is something on estate and gift taxes possible this year?

It's not likely, but we know where the problem areas are. One thing that disturbs

people is the relationship between the rates on gift and estate taxes. Another is whether we should continue to let an individual give away everything he has at death and avoid taxes on any of it. At the same time, I think we ought to look at these excessively heavy estate tax rates that encourage people to find ways around them.

TRADE AND QUOTAS

Will we have a trade bill this year?

I doubt we'll have it this year. But next year I expect we will.

Can any trade bill get through Congress without becoming protectionist?

It must get through. We must do this: We must open up avenues for those industries and employees who are affected adversely by imports to get relief in an orderly way that is within the purview of the General Agreement on Tariffs & Trade. We should not take these unilateral actions except as a last resort. There are people who want us to have quotas on practically everything, but if we go down that road, we head into a very costly trade war.

I have said that some commodities require quotas in order to restrain the heavy increases in imports to this country. The way to do it is to sit down as friends with the countries involved and let them know what we will have to do ultimately if we don't get their cooperation. But if you legislate quotas, they will retaliate. That way you begin to sterilize the world and bring it back to the days of the Hawley-Smoot tariff.

Which commodities do you think need quotas?

Primarily textiles, because that production is very susceptible to the low wages paid in developing countries. It's very easy to teach people the work in a textile plant. Same with a shoe plant. I think there's an equally great problem in some areas of electronics, and no effort has been made yet that I know of to get anyone abroad to limit shipments to us.

Are you considering adjustment aid?

No, I think adjustment assistance is a temporary thing, like unemployment compensation. It's not a solution.

Will you be able to keep the protectionist sentiment under control?

I hope so, because we can have protection in the sense that I'm talking about just as easily and do less harm.

How do you feel about labor's claim that American jobs are being exported by American companies' setting up foreign subsidiaries?

I'm not saying they're not. Labor has a point. But perhaps the companies that are doing this would not be able to sell the same article abroad if it were made in the U.S.

MARKS FOR PHASE II

What marks do you give the Administration for its handling of international economic policies since Aug. 15, when we devalued and imposed controls?

Oh, you have to give them some mark. I don't know whether it would be a C or a D. It had to be done. But the methods used have made us enemies unnecessarily.

What marks do you give Phase II?

It's still a little early to say finally how successful Phase II will be. It doesn't look as successful on prices as I had hoped. I don't know how successful it is going to be on holding down wages because all I read about in the papers are exceptions to the guidelines initially laid down. If the exceptions become the general rule, we'll have as much inflation as we ever had. This doesn't mean this kind of incomes policy cannot work. It would if we let it.

Speaking of national concerns, why does the most powerful man on Capitol Hill want to be President?

I've said repeatedly that I don't really want the job in the sense of some of my compatriots, who seem to be obsessed with

the idea of having it. It's the most onerous job in the world, the most lonesome position a man can be in. I know all of this, but I do have a very deep and abiding interest in the future of my country and I'm not at all satisfied with the course we're on now. I think it leads to chaos.

Frankly, I'd much rather someone else have the nomination. But here I am, saying that I'm not only available but I'm going to go to the convention working hard to get delegates in the hope that, whether I get it or not, we come out with a candidate who can win and with a program that can win. I am very fearful about where we'll go with four more years of the kind of policies we've been following.

What's behind the sense of chaos you note, and what can the President do?

The President has to instill in the minds of people a greater degree of confidence than President Nixon has—about himself, his program, his management of the affairs of state, and his decision making. The American people have grown tired of being taken by surprise every time a decision is made.

I think they wonder also about the order of priorities this Administration will establish on spending. They wonder why it is that in the first four years President Nixon prepares the budget the government has to borrow \$123-billion, more debt than we ran up in the 23 years after World War II.

Is this deficit getting us enough economic return? Is the budget as stimulative as it looks?

It would be extremely stimulative at this amount ordinarily. What the Administration has done should have eliminated unemployment by now. But when you throw the question of confidence into the basket with these budgetary and monetary stimulants, the lack of confidence is the overpowering force and offsets any action we take.

If unemployment is still high this summer, would you back proposals for more public employment or public works?

It may be necessary. I'm not necessarily against these ideas. I would have to evaluate them then.

Should the Administration have moved much more quickly toward stimulation and anti-inflation measures?

It's more basic than that. I think the Administration missed the boat in not attacking this problem of credibility and confidence and getting people in the frame of mind that will permit stimulatives to be effective.

EYE ON THE WHITE HOUSE

Does this mean replacing Republicans in the White House with Democrats?

If this President can't restore the necessary confidence by election time, the voters will take care of that.

If you could go into the convention with a strong block of delegates, what policies would you hope to bring about?

I'm definitely not interested, as some editorials have implied, in being a king maker. I just have in mind the desire to get people elected who are dedicated to changing the course we're following.

Other than the Presidency, is there any other job that might appeal to you?

No, I have no interest in the Vice-Presidency or a Cabinet position. I think I probably could have had a Cabinet position long ago, but I don't have any interest in it. Never have wanted to be anything except chairman of the Ways & Means Committee.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF FOREIGN AND MILITARY POLICIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, there is an urgent need for improved congressional review of U.S. external policies. The Senate has demonstrated some ability to engage the executive branch in external policy debate. The House of Representatives has not. These comments focus upon the external policy role of this latter body in which I serve.

The disastrous policy pursued by President Nixon in South Asia reveals the futility of congressional intervention in foreign policy crises. Before the India-Pakistan war, Congress spoke its mind by voting to terminate aid to Pakistan. The President instead threatened India with termination of aid while haltingly slowing aid to Pakistan. When war broke out, he quickly announced that aid to India was stopped and ordered a carrier task force into the Bay of Bengal, clearly an anti-Indian move. Congress proposed, the President disposed.

Unless we are to tie the hands of the President, we must focus congressional attention—not on immediate crises—but on the more important long-term issues which determine the external policies of the United States.

Congress might serve as an intermediary between the President and the people. In this role, Congress gives the President the widest possible support and latitude while placating or fending off those in the public-at-large who disagree with the President's policies. For most of my 9 years in the House, this has been the role of the House. The House establishment either agreed with or deferred to the President on every major foreign or military policy issue. Typically, the Armed Services Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee heard only administration witnesses. The House questioning of administration witnesses rarely uncovered the alternatives debated before the administration closed ranks around the final decision. We were unaware that options existed.

Administration witnesses grew confident and intellectually lazy. It was simple to "con" the Congress, or at least the House. Strategies and objectives could be simply defended by labeling them "vital interests" or "in the national interest" or "essential to national security."

The loss, of course, was to the nation. Where policies were in error or where fundamental assumptions were wrong, the last chance for change was lost. This compounded the chances for error because fundamental reexamination of established policy in the executive branch seldom occurred.

Can Congress, including the House, more effectively review policy assumptions and judgments? The difficulties are formidable.

The House Committee tend not only to guard jealously their jurisdiction they also frequently are overly protective of the agency with which they coexist. When the President, too, is supportive of that agency's policy, change is enormously difficult. For example, on a major antiwar vote, only seven—about 20 percent—of the 37 current members of the House Armed Services Committee voted the antiwar position. Not one of the

seven was a Republican. The House itself voted roughly 50 percent in favor of this antiwar proposition.

The same pattern was repeated a few months ago except the antiwar vote among the members of the Armed Services Committee dropped to six.

Similarly, on the appropriations subcommittee dealing with the Armed Forces, only one of the 10 members voted for these antiwar amendments. The one dissenter to the Republican President's policy was a Democrat. Even today there is little antiwar sentiment in the key committees controlling the funding of the war in Southeast Asia.

Another major difficulty is the failure of the House to challenge its own views. On important matters it is rare, indeed, that hearings or debates lead directly to opinion changes in the House. If these hearings and debates have any influence, it is on the outside world which then, in turn, makes its views known to Congress. When Members seek to influence their colleagues, their efforts are usually directed to the media in the belief that changing the climate outside the House will lead most directly to changes within the House.

Part of our problem in the House is that we focus on too many details. When the underlying premises is faulty, details are meaningless. The Armed Services Committee wrestles with the nuts and bolts of individual weapons systems. The House Foreign Affairs Committee listens to endless testimony on details of foreign aid. Both listen to administration witnesses who, it seems, need only change the date on last year's testimony.

The need is to move to the larger issues—to ask hard questions and probe deeply into options. Such activity may not impress other Members of the House but it will have an impact within the executive branch. Moreover, by deliberately seeking qualified witnesses from professional and academic groups critical of administration policies and programs, a wider dialog will be stimulated. If this process is pursued vigorously, the public may never find that it must take to the streets to get the attention of the Congress or to change an erroneous policy.

A multitude of issues beg for deep exploration. One remarkable feature of this administration, for example, is its insensitivity to the fate of the oppressed people of the world. Whether it be the lonely plights of the disfranchised members of the Greek Parliament, the black Africans in Rhodesia who see their birthright being sold out by the developed white world, the slaughtered thousands in Bangladesh, or the young Americans now in Canada who are refugees from an immoral war, this administration appears indifferent. And this indifference raises fundamental questions about the basic purposes of existing U.S. policies.

There are other issues requiring the close attention of Congress.

The arms race and the increased military budget deserve careful review. To my knowledge, not a single recommendation of the Department of Defense concerning strategic weaponry has ever been refused or modified by the House

Armed Services Committee. Yet the United States held a commanding lead over the Soviet Union in this area all through the 1960's as we built sophisticated strategic systems which destabilized the balance of terror.

Each feature of our military posture needs to be examined for its impact on the arms race. Some military forces are not as likely to generate an arms race as others. The strategic arms race has a dynamism of its own. And, not only is it inordinately costly, it also leads to progressively less security for all participants.

One effect of intransigence by those who push military budgets ever higher is that critics of military spending tend to become increasingly hostile to a military establishment which appears indifferent to or incapable of engaging in a sensible exchange of views. An approach that defines the Indian Ocean as vital to the security of the United States leaves little room for reasonable dialog.

Congress must equip itself with competent advisers if it is to subject the administration's policies to the critical review that our national welfare requires. We have the resources, both in money and talent. What is lacking is the political will. The congressional establishment is largely content to let the administration have its way. Those outside Congress should express themselves in the strongest possible way when they disagree. This helps create pressure to bring change to the Congress. That is the way the system works. In every possible way, they should ask that Congress play the role it can perform best—to publicly air and critically scrutinize our military and external policies.

The need is urgent. In 1964 and early 1965, except for two foresighted men in the Senate, Members of the House and Senate failed to foresee the implications of measures we were then approving. I wonder which policies we uncritically accept today will turn out to be destructive of the welfare of this country and of its fundamental instinct to be decent. All citizens must participate in the abrasive process which can test our own and our Government's beliefs. In this way our Nation may safely and wisely make its way through the turbulence of world affairs.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON REAL ESTATE, FHA, MORTGAGE, AND INSURANCE ABUSES TO BE HELD IN CHICAGO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, in a few weeks, the city of Chicago will be the host for a very unusual and hopefully highly productive meeting. The meeting: the "National Conference on Real Estate, FHA, Mortgage, and Insurance Abuses" is sponsored by the West Side Coalition, a neighborhood organization which is based in my congressional district.

The West Side Coalition is a growing organization which represents nine

church and community groups on the west side of Chicago, who have banded together in an attempt to solve the real estate and housing problems which have come to plague their community.

They feel that only by uniting can they effectively counter what they see as the three major causes of economic decline in their communities: fraudulent and unethical real estate practices by unscrupulous realtors; banks and mortgage companies who fail to show their confidence in the neighborhoods by refusing to lend conventional money for mortgages; and finally discriminatory practices by insurance companies which results in entire neighborhoods being written off as bad risks without consideration of individual cases involved.

This national conference is an attempt to establish lines of communication between groups in the various cities in this country which are faced with similar problems of unfair realty practices. It is the hope of the coordinators of this conference, Gale Cincotta and Edward Stefaniak of the West Side Coalition, that the 3 days of meetings will provide the participants with insight into possible action programs that will help them deal with problems in their own neighborhoods there by allowing them to extend their programs to other communities with similar problems.

Mr. Speaker, the necessity of a national conference of this type demonstrates the seriousness of the problem of real estate abuse in this country. It has become one of the prime reasons our center cities have been rapidly deteriorating. Various mortgages abuses, combined with "blockbusting" have served to destroy the elements of pride and unity in our neighborhood structures. It has reached the point that it now costs our center city dweller more and more to remain poor. For insurance cancellation, coupled with the lack of availability of conventional mortgage money, has forced people to either move out of their traditional neighborhoods, or if they wish to remain, pay more through FHA.

The National Conference on Real Estate, FHA, Mortgage, and Insurance Abuses will be held at Saint Sylvester's Schwinn Auditorium in Chicago on March 18, 19, and 20. At present the sponsors anticipate that more than 1,000 persons will come to Chicago to discuss this important matter. To date they have commitments from at least two presidential candidates and some national experts in the field of housing.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that this gathering will be successful in focusing national attention on the growing problem of real estate abuse in this country. As a lifelong resident of the northwest side of Chicago, and as a man who is very proud of the community in which I was born and still live, I believe that the preservation of the traditional neighborhoods in our urban areas is a must if we are ever to achieve the quality of life in our cities which we so ardently seek.

A TRIBUTE TO DON ELLINGER FROM HIS SON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Kansas (Mr. Roy) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, through his son, Jeff, who is on my congressional staff, I was privileged to know Don Ellinger, the national director of the Machinists Non-Partisan League, who passed away suddenly on February 12, 1972.

Don was a man of courage and conviction whose involvement and accomplishments in political and social action were widely recognized and praised.

Don was a family man, and his greatest legacy to us are his wife and children who carry his commitment and theirs to equality and justice for all people.

I can think of no greater testimony to the meaning and significance of Don Ellinger's life than the respect, admiration, and love of a son. Mr. Speaker, following is an eloquent tribute to Don Ellinger written by his son, Jeff:

My father, despite all of his accomplishments, despite his immense enjoyment of the present and despite the way he always looked towards the future, would have been more suited to the Republic of Rome, perhaps, or to Twelfth Century England during the Crusades. He would have been at home any place or time that ideals and love of God and Man were the prevailing attitudes. Don was in the business of forcing (by political means) recalcitrant politicians to follow a course that, if taken voluntarily, would have been very noble. His main regret was that anyone had to be coerced into nobility.

Don always said that the main problem in solving a problem was deciding exactly how to go about it. His attitude regarding the present trend towards "getting priorities in order" was to ignore that part of the problem. By cutting down on the enormous waste in America (Vietnam, mainly, and the arms race), he believed we could free enough money to deal with all of the pressing needs and have enough left over to continue our part in Man's upward climb.

"Why," he asked me, "do people say we've got to either build the SST or feed poor people? Why does it have to be either going to the moon or caring for the sick? We can do all of these things. We are the richest nation on the face of the earth; why can't we be remembered by history as the one that not only insured health for its people, but took a few more steps upwards?"

One of the few things Don disliked about the present was the absence, in the modern American family, of traditions. He tried to make his own home the place for learning about life and how to interact properly with society that he thought every home should be. There were nights the roof rang with debate, and he rarely lost. But he never got angry or resentful, and he never closed the subject just because he felt he wasn't getting the better end of the discussion. He felt that traditions were a major part of our home.

"Traditions prevent anyone from feeling completely alone, with no way to draw strength from history or family. A society composed of complete individuals will fall apart from loneliness."

He called us a tribe, and he made us into one. When the news of his death reached the members of the tribe away from home, everyone stopped and just got on board the first plane they could find. From Sausalito, California; from Berkeley, California; from Austin, Texas; from New York; from Pennsylvania; from Cleveland; from St. Louis; everyone came home. He would have been enormously pleased.

He was noble, but practical; idealistic, yet pragmatic; sometimes a tyrant, but it was a benign tyranny. We respected him tremendously; we loved him even more.

POLICE COMMUNITY RELATIONS PROJECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ADDABBO) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, last year I brought to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives a most interesting project in the field of police community relations. That project was instituted by two able and energetic men who serve the 106th precinct, New York City Police Department, in Ozone Park, Queens, N.Y. I have been particularly interested in the progress of this program because it began in my home community, and I am pleased to report that the project has achieved great success.

The two men responsible for this community effort are Sgt. Edward Doyle and Patrolman George D. Olivet. They dedicated their efforts to bringing to the public a better understanding of law enforcement officers, their problems, and the constitutional rights of our citizens, and the interplay between these two important areas of police community relations.

The lectures which these men give at community meetings have played a major role in improving police community relations. The official publication of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc., is the Police Chief and the program begun by Sergeant Doyle and Patrolman Olivet is featured in the March 1972 issue of that magazine.

I would like to place in the RECORD at this point for the information of my colleagues the text of the article, entitled "An Invitation to Understanding—The Citizen and His Constitutional Rights," as it appears in the March 1972 edition of Police Chief:

AN INVITATION TO UNDERSTANDING

(By Edward Doyle and George D. Olivet)

Many Americans are firmly convinced that they have sufficient knowledge of the law; even enough to say, "I know my rights!" Theoretically this may be true, but the practical application of their knowledge indicates otherwise. Unless we are involved on a personal or professional basis with the elements of "constitutional rights" most of us tend to be apathetic and take them for granted. The problem generated between the police and the community due to these careless attitudes are serious enough for professional consideration.

When the U.S. Constitution was enacted, Americans were possibly more aware of their rights; prior to that time their rights were ignored or violated. Presently, the dignity of all individuals, even those who violate the law, is recognized and protected under the Constitution.

Ideally, all citizens should be given the opportunity to obtain more personal knowledge about their rights under the law. This increased knowledge can bridge the gap between the public and their police, bring about a better understanding of associated police problems, and produce a more cohesive police/community relationship.

A brief survey of educational institutions by the authors disclosed a broad-based lack of instruction on Constitutional Law; even in the basic need to know one's rights. In the elementary and secondary levels of education there is little if any attempt to instruct students on this subject. A child could possibly recite the "Bill of Rights" and never understand the purpose for which it was written;

this is also true of many adult members of society. Unless an individual receives a college-level education it is probable that no proper course of instruction in one's Constitutional Rights will be made available to him.

Law enforcement officers in their sensitive position in the criminal justice system must be cognizant of citizen's rights as granted in the U.S. Constitution and as defined by court interpretations, particularly by the United States Supreme Court. Those who are entrusted with the protection of society's rights must have knowledge of, as well as thoroughly understand the principles of, the Constitution as it applies to the duties of law enforcement.

The New York City Police Department is presently issuing Legal Division bulletins which define the legal requirements of local and federal laws to insure that all department personnel are adequately informed. Measures also are being taken in other agencies to add professional instruction to police courses across the nation.

The general lack of knowledge about the law often causes improper demands for police service—even to the extent that some demands may violate the constitutional rights of other citizens. Complaints have been received charging that policemen failed to take proper action in certain instances and subsequent investigation showed that if the policemen had taken the demanded action it would have resulted in the outright denial of another's civil rights. Yielding to these demands would have meant a gross violation of the public trust placed in law enforcement, and therefore must be denied.

In February, 1970, the authors polled the community on its knowledge of "Constitutional Law" and the associated law enforcement problems. The results indicated an overwhelming need for a clearer understanding by the community on this vital subject.

Aware of the need, the team launched Phase Two of its *Invitation to Understanding* program¹ involving a series of lectures on the Constitutional Law titled, "What The Constitution Means To You!" The team members believe that law enforcement must take the initiative in answering the need, hoping that other professions will eventually make their own contribution to the public education effort.

"What The Constitution Means To You!" was structured so as to be acceptable and easily understood by those not versed in the law. The first of many presentations was well received in July, 1970, by a large audience representative of the community. Public interest, community participation and enthusiasm have encouraged the authors to continue the presentations of this lecture series.

LECTURE MATERIAL

A brief description of the lecture material is given below for those desiring to use it as a model. All of the "Definitions, Amendments, and Case Studies" are uniformly applicable in the fifty states, but any local "Case Studies" relevant to a particular lecture can also be used if their addition will add clarification.

Lecture 1—Law of arrest

Definitions: Arrest, Crime, Probable Cause, Reasonable Grounds, Use of Force.

Amendments: Fourth (secure in their persons) and Fourteenth (due process).

Case Studies: *Henry v. U.S.*, 361 U.S. 98 (1959).

Ker v. California, 374 U.S. 23 (1963).

Aquilar v. Texas, 378 U.S. 108 (1964).

U.S. v. Ventresca, 380 U.S. 102 (1965).

The utilization of pertinent case studies gives a practical application of the U.S. Constitution to matters of criminal law and

hence a better understanding of the guarantees it affords the citizen with regard to the individual's rights. The complexities under which law enforcement must function are inherent in each case described.

Lecture 2—Custodial interrogation

Definitions: Custody, Questioning, Confession, Coercion, Duress, Line-up.

Amendments: Fifth (self-incrimination), Sixth (right to counsel), and Fourteenth (due process).

Case Studies: *Payne v. State*, 356 U.S. 560 (1958).

Mallory v. U.S., 354 U.S. 449 (1957).

Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 (1966).

Escobedo v. Illinois, 378 U.S. 478 (1964).

A clear understanding of "custody" and when it begins is mandatory for the audience to understand the other procedures which govern law enforcement in the area of questioning and confessions.

Lecture 3—Stop and frisk

Definitions: Reasonable Suspicion, Frisk, Search, and Authority for Stops.

Amendments: Fourth (secure in their persons) and Fourteenth (due process).

Case Studies: *Mitchell v. U.S.* 179 F.Supp. 636 (1969).

People v. Rivera, 201 (1964).

Murphy v. State, 378 Su(24) 73 (1964).

Intent of this lecture is to achieve a clearer understanding of normal and standard police procedure.

Lecture 4—Search and seizure

Definitions: Exclusionary Rule, Evidence, Silver Platter Doctrine, Search Warrant, and Necessary Force.

Amendments: Fourth (secure in their persons) and Fourteenth (due process).

Case Studies: *Weeks v. U.S.*, 232 U.S. 383 (1914).

Mapp v. Ohio, 367 U.S. 643 (1961).

Jackson v. U.S. 354 (1965).

This clarifies the complex procedures governing the performance of law enforcement.

Lecture 5—Citizen's rights if arrested

Amendments: Fourth (unreasonable search and seizure), Fifth (double jeopardy and self-incrimination), Sixth (right to counsel, speedy trial), Eighth (bail, cruel and unusual punishment), and Fourteenth (due process).

The general scope of the criminal justice system and its procedures from the initial arrest to eventual prosecution and the privileges guaranteed to citizens under the Constitution are included in this lecture.

Lecture 6—Civil dissent

Definitions: Petition, Trespass, Public Order, Riot, Anarchy, Inflammatory.

Amendments: First (free speech and right to assemble).

Case Studies: *Cox v. Louisiana*, 379 U.S. 536 (1965).

Flener v. New York, 340 U.S. 315 (1951).

The position and purpose of law enforcement officers at scenes of demonstrations, parades, strikes, etc., are to maintain order and prevent a breach of the peace, not to interfere with the rights of citizens to participate. Often the police become the target because they are the visible arm of government. This unenviable position and its resulting problems are clearly projected to the audience.

PRESENTATION TECHNIQUES

The Constitutional Law Lectures were initially presented prior to the monthly meetings of the 106th Precinct Community Council.² This series took six months to com-

² A police/community organization of concerned citizens and local police officials who meet on a monthly basis seeking solutions to community problems through mutual planning. The Executive Committee of the Community Council includes four elected community members, and the precinct's Commanding Officer.

plete. Since then, they have been presented to other community organizations on a weekly and bimonthly basis.

The authors found that one hour was sufficient time for presentation of a lecture, including a question-and-answer period at the end of each session which was planned as an integral part of the program to help the audience become participants through involvement. This dialogue at the end of each session is possibly the most significant part of the hour, for citizens at last had the opportunity to ask their police officials, "What do the landmark decisions given by the Supreme Court, such as *Miranda*, *Mapp*, etc., mean to me as an individual?"

To maximize dialogue, and minimize friction, a set of ground rules was established by the lecturers which included the following:

1. No questions or comments are to be made during the lecture period. (Index cards were distributed to all for taking notes and recording questions which were held for the appropriate time.)

2. Debate is to be minimized, but pertinent remarks are solicited. (Digression from the evening's topic was discouraged.)

3. Those people needing further explanation should see lecturers at the close of the program. (It was also suggested that anyone wishing to ask further questions could do so by postcard or letter, and they would receive an answer.)

Several booklets on the "U.S. Constitution" and "Civil Rights" were distributed to the participants with the request that they be brought to each session for reference and home study assignments. A list of recommended texts was also distributed for those wishing to involve themselves further in the subject. (See *Bibliography*.)

A newsclip file of current newspaper articles on lecture topics was maintained by the lecturers and some of the participants themselves submitted articles. From this material the authors geared the dialogue to pertinent current issues.

To dramatize particular points of difficulty involving law enforcement in its role as protector of "citizens' rights," the authors introduced "role playing" into the presentation. Short playlets were structured and presented by members of the community showing the practical application of the mandated procedures that must be adhered to by policemen. This technique emphasized the sensitive position of policemen who as enforcers of the law must insure that citizens' rights be protected and demonstrated the application of "rights" to both the "law abiding" and the "law violator." The reading of the *Miranda* Warning to a supposed criminal, in front of a community audience, demonstrated the problems facing policemen as well as the rights to which each individual is entitled.

The material presented to members of the community enabled them to understand better the role of law enforcement, their own rights under the law, and the equal guarantees under the U.S. Constitution to which all citizens are entitled.

EVALUATION

Participants in the lecture series have indicated to the authors that the instruction did not fall on deaf ears. Many individuals have stated that it is now clear to them that policemen must function under the law, and not outside it; arrests on mere suspicion, intensive interrogation, illegal searches, and unlawful incarceration are "police-state" tactics certainly unwanted in America!

Community leaders, members of the legal profession, clergymen, teachers, and average citizens have all given their praise and encouragement to this program as well as their enthusiastic participation in it. There has been an increased number of requests for presentation of the lecture series.

Shortly after the project began, it became obvious that there was a positive response to

¹ William McGarry, Doyle and Olivet, "An Invitation to Understanding," *The Police Chief*, Vol. 38 (June, 1971), pp. 20-27.

this new educational activity. Community requests for police service were more realistic and valid, perhaps due to the public's increased knowledge of necessary police procedures. Complaints from the members of the community also have been relevant and in keeping with the guidelines defined in the constitutional lectures. An informed public is a great asset to law enforcement.

It is a fair evaluation to say that the program is meaningful to the public, a valuable source of education, and a unique police service to society as well as to law enforcement. The clarification of citizens' rights and the police role in society lends itself to a more cohesive and responsible police community relationship.

We are convinced by our participation in Phase Two of *Invitation to Understanding* that more public education is needed in Constitutional Law. First, the police must have abundant knowledge concerning the constitutional guarantees afforded the citizen; second, the citizen must be made cognizant of his rights and develop an awareness that they are precious possessions; and, third, the obvious need for other professionals and public officials to make a contribution in overcoming ignorance and apathy in the area of "rights" must be realized.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barrett, Bruton, and Hannold, *Constitutional Law Cases And Materials* (Foundation Press, Inc., 1964).

Bender, Matthew & Company, *Gilbert's Criminal Law And Procedure* (Bender & Company, 1970).

Creamer, J. Shane, *A Citizen's Guide To Legal Rights* (Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, 1971).

Inbau & Sowle, *Criminal Justice Cases And Comments* (The Foundation Press, Inc., 1960).

Justice, Department of, *Handbook On The Law Of Search And Seizures* (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968).

Klotter & Kanovitz, *Constitutional Law For Police* (W. H. Anderson Company, 1970).
New York State Police, *Manual For Police* (New York State Police, 1971).

Padover, Saul K., *The Living United States Constitution* (The New American Library, Inc., 1953).

Rothblatt, Henry, *The Arrest: Probable Cause And Search Without A Search Warrant* (The Mississippi Law Journal Reprint, 1964).

United States Riot Commission, *Report of The National Advisory Commission On Civil Disorders* (E. P. Dutton and Company, 1969).

NADER RECRUITS RETIREE RAIDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues and I are deeply concerned about the problems that face the aging citizens of this Nation. We have a desire and responsibility to assist them in living out their lives in the tradition to which they are most accustomed.

Our more senior citizens are many times unable to control the forces that attack their happiness and well-being. Disease, very limited finances, and inadequate health care and facilities are a few of the enemies that confront our aging Americans.

The Federal Government has an obligation to care for those who have cared for us and have taught us and have supported us.

But I am pleased to note that the Gov-

ernment is not the only resort to assistance that our senior Americans have. Mr. Ralph Nader, who is a true crusader for a better today and a brighter tomorrow in the United States, is turning to the retired ranks of Americans to help him in confronting the evils that threaten the aged of this country.

In the February 28, 1972, edition of the Washington Post there appeared an article by Judith Martin concerning Mr. Nader's plan to use retirees to focus on problems of the aged by using their vast experience and talent that would normally have gone to waste after their professional careers had ended.

Mr. Nader can not only perhaps bring more attention and suggestions for solutions to the plight of the aging, but he will instill in those he employs a feeling of worthfulness and usefulness that is too often absent from the thoughts of a retired American.

I wish him every success and cooperation in his efforts, and I thank him for what he has done and will continue to do on behalf of the American public.

I include at this point a copy of Mrs. Martin's article in the RECORD so that my interested and concerned colleagues will be aware of another service that Mr. Nader is initiating on behalf of us all:

NADER RECRUITS RETIREE RAIDERS

(By Judith Martin)

Ralph Nader is recruiting among the retired.

His newest group of Raiders is not characterized by the flying ties or free-swinging hair of the bright young law graduates he usually attracts. The men wear tie clips, and the women have their hair "done."

With respectability, experience—and time—to offer the consumer cause, retired people represent a vast reservoir of educated, volunteer labor. Nader hopes to tap that reservoir through Public Citizen, Inc., his citizen participation organization.

His first Retired Professional Action Group consists of 10 people in their 50s and 60s who work out of a small Dupont Circle office suite on problems of health care, transportation, taxes, nursing homes, veteran's benefits, public transportation and age discrimination in employment.

Formation of the group, intended to be augmented by many such task forces around the country, was announced only yesterday. But it is already involved in a suit to stop D.C. Transit from raising fares.

While the groups will focus on problems of the aged, Nader said he can see them utilizing their technical skills to work on any aspect of the society they feel needs change.

He said that he also sees the idea as a solution for skilled people whose talents would ordinarily go to waste after their professional careers have ended.

"This will be an expression for thousands of people who are getting tired of playing shuffleboard and bridge day in and day out, and who want to develop real citizen power," he said.

Old people in the United States are treated with "a combination of condescension, contempt and ridicule," he said, and are often made erroneously to believe that they are, in fact, incapable of contributing to society.

"They can no longer rely on reverence for their wisdom. In a fast-changing society, experience means less and less. Nor can they rely on filial piety, because our mobility and housing mean that families are separated. It's got to be something new."

"By beginning to involve themselves in the problems of the society, they can command the respect of the rest of the population."

We're never going to resurrect the idea of wisdom, but they can have power and relevance."

The Nader organization has had volunteers ranging from military personnel who retire in their 40s to people in their 70s. They are looking for accountants, financial analysts, physicians, lawyers, engineers, scientists, statisticians and writers, among others, but emphasize that it is technical skills, rather than degrees, which are needed.

The Washington group includes an expert on mass transportation, an accountant who is investigating Medicare and Medicaid overpayments, a lawyer specializing in veterans' affairs, and an expert on the problems of aging. They are retired and work as volunteers in the office, which receives a \$40,000 budget from Public Citizen, Inc.

Nader believes not only that the contacts, experience and availability of these people will be of special use for citizen advocacy, but that they have a peculiar freedom to act idealistically.

"They're as free as they ever will be from the restraints of jobs, bosses and the bureaucratic hierarchy," he said.

Inquiries regarding the work of the group should be addressed to the Retired Professional Action Group, Suite 711, 2000 P St. NW, Washington, D.C. 20036. Telephone (202) 785-3266.

ATTENDED CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, from January 17 through January 21, 1972, I attended the Conference of African and American Representatives in Lusaka, Zambia. The conference was hosted by the President of the Republic of Zambia, the Honorable Dr. Kenneth D. Kaunda.

Twelve members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives traveled to Africa to meet with ministers, parliamentarians, and government officials from 15 African countries. Our discussions revolved around the questions of economic aid to Africa, and American and African policy in regard to Southern African issues.

The meeting was an historic and important one for many reasons. It was, for example, the first time that four black Members of the House of Representatives stood on African soil at the same time.

It was also a significant encounter, because in-depth discussions uncovered the hypocrisies in American foreign policy as it relates to Africa. We learned that our Government grants tax breaks to American businesses which are working within, and thus condoning, the ignominious system of apartheid.

I speak of two American mining firms, American Metal Climax and Newmont Mining Corp., which are perpetuating the deplorable contract labor situation in Namibia, a country which is being occupied illegally by the South African Government.

Pursuant to the conference, the members of the Congressional Black Caucus who had participated called upon the administration to revoke the tax credit now enjoyed by those two companies. In 1970 alone, tax credits resulted in a benefit to the two companies of \$9.58 million.

As the situation stands now, not only is our Government permitting these two companies to insure the continuation of apartheid—we are paying them to do it.

In his opening remarks before the conference on January 17, 1972, President Kaunda called for an end to hypocritical practices by our Government. He issued a plea for mutual understanding and respect between the peoples of Africa and America. He articulated the goals, not only of his own nation, but of all the independent African countries. He spoke of the affinity that exists between Africans and black Americans. He said:

We in Zambia are prepared to co-operate with every nation in the world that is ready to treat us on the basis of equality and respect. There is every reason why we should increase our co-operation with the United States. Our ties are deeply rooted in history, through the presence in that continent of millions of the descendants of Africans with whom we have unbreakable bonds of affinity.

Zambia and the other independent African countries are, without question, the nations of the future. If my colleague read the entirety of Dr. Kaunda's remarks, they will have a better understanding of why that is so. The address follows:

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY DR. K. D. KAUNDA

It is a pleasure for me to be able to open this Conference of African and American representatives. I extend to you all, on behalf of the Party, Government and the people of Zambia, cordial greetings. It is our hope that your stay in Zambia will be both enjoyable and fruitful.

We in Zambia welcome meetings like this one which afford us the opportunity to exchange information and views on matters which are of vital interest to us. The endeavours which are being made through frank discussions give expression to the new and growing interest among the American people in matters relating to Africa and her problems; in the welfare of the people of this continent.

I, therefore, wish to pay tribute to the organizers of the Conference. We cannot expect dramatic achievements in these efforts; these are often intangible. The amount of effort being made to create a better understanding between Africans and Americans underlines the major hurdle in the improvement of human relations, as they affect the people of America and the people of Africa, as well as the entire world community.

Relations between the people of America and Africa are in many ways natural. They are a natural consequence of human development. America is largely a Nation of people descended from many continents. The majority of them are descendants of the people of Europe and Africa. America's relationship with Europe cannot escape the influence of history. America is Europe-oriented.

The interests of the people of America in Europe's future were forged by history even though time may be driving the two continents apart. There are good reasons why America should have been Africa-oriented. Africa's relationship with America could have been stronger than it is today except for the factor of race. The ties that bind America and Africa are deeply rooted in the history of the African-American community in the continent. These ties had been buried under the debris of the much decimated African image by colonialism; but now they have been brought back to life. Africans in Africa feel a sense of growing affinity with Africans in America. The first decade of African independence has given more than a hope in the continent's future. Despite

immense problems, our initial achievements have given a new realisation of the growing potential of the African people to contribute to peace and the well-being of mankind as a whole.

We in Africa, therefore, deserve to be understood. We deserve the assistance of other continents in order to be able to join them effectively in the defence of peace and in building progress and security for all.

The value of this Conference must, therefore, lie in the greater understanding it must help create among the people of America and the world about the problems of Africa, the desires and aspirations of the African people and their determination to work out a future which will guarantee a decent life and a life full of promise. The task of all of us is more than improving relations between Governments. It is much more fundamental than that. It involves improving the understanding of Africans by the Americans and of the Americans by the Africans. In this way increased co-operation will be possible. In this way we will be able to achieve the goals of peace and development.

It is the paradox of our era that having achieved so much in the field of science and technology to improve the human condition, we have done so little to improve Man's understanding of himself; to improve the relations amongst the people of the world. This is the greatest weakness in Man's material success. However, Man's success in science and technology must slowly drive us towards greater interdependence and one world community. Therefore, we can no longer merely be concerned with achievements in material progress. We must succeed in building better human relations.

It is in this realisation, that we in Zambia, a non-racial State, are always ready to play host to visitors from any parts of the world.

In our conduct we are guided by the knowledge that Africa stands midway between the continents of the East and the continents of the West. We share the problems of the Pacific Ocean which on the other side of the globe divides the Americas from the continent of Asia.

The Pacific Ocean is an international waterway for competing ideologies; but the continent of Africa consists of independent States. We, on this continent, cannot allow our countries to be the battleground for competing ideologies. We have only one ideology—the ideology of peace and development.

We know our primary responsibilities. We know the responsibilities which are beyond our competence to discharge alone and which must be shared with other members of the international community. We know that today's activities create our tomorrow, and our present lives determine the bridge on which we must enter the next life. In today's activities, it is our primary task to provide the basic needs of the people. They need among others water, food and shelter. These must be improved both in quality and quantity. We have already declared an all out war on poverty, ignorance and disease, a war we must win. We must improve the image of Africa by the decency of the people, the stability and prosperity of independent African States. To achieve these goals, we need the means: namely, professional and technical skills and equipment with which to exploit the resources to solve the immediate, short and long term economic and social problems. We know that peace and stability are vital prerequisites to our success. We will continue to strengthen them.

We know our needs to be pressing and our resources to be limited. We know peace and development to be expensive while the world conditions are generally cruel.

Our policies are formulated in the context of our understanding of these problems. Some of our economic policies must certain-

ly be baffling to Americans, just as we are equally baffled by the poverty which manifests itself in many ways in an affluent America able to support expensive space programmes. We never call these prestige projects. Americans say that we Africans have our priorities wrong; we in turn point to ghettos in America's flourishing cities vis-a-vis space research programmes and say Americans have their priorities upside down.

In the circumstances, we in Africa can only ask you people in America to understand that our continent is a late comer in a race for prosperity. We are in a hurry to get to a higher level of advancement. All our resources that supported the European industry during the colonial period must be devoted to our development efforts to give substance to national hopes; to the task of matching the aspirations of the people of this continent.

We do welcome foreign investment. We want it. We need it. We would like to expand trade with all nations of the world that offer us fair terms. If we should succeed in expanding trade, this will greatly add to the number of ties that now bind our various nations in an interdependent world community. We are necessarily sensitive, but not hypersensitive, about exploitation of our resources at our expense. We have been dominated in the past; we have been exploited. The history of European and African contact did not favour the interests of the majority of the people. We, therefore, are striving to ensure that the benefits of industrial and technological revolution in Africa accrue to the people of Africa. This is why we would like greater participation of the African people in building their economies while leaving vast room for foreign investors. We ask for no more than fair play in the relations between men and nations, particularly in the exploitation of the resources of our countries.

We cannot genuinely say that private investment alone will achieve for us social justice and yet in order to strengthen democracy, every investment must, in the final analysis, add to the contentment of the people. It must help us solve economic and social problems directly or indirectly.

While we in independent Africa are working out our own future participation in shaping our destiny, there are millions in Southern Africa who are still denied this God-given right. You will be discussing this problem. It is an important factor in African-American relations.

There are many reasons why Southern African crisis deserves the attention of the United States. First, it is a moral issue which continues to prick the moral conscience of the world.

Secondly, America is a super-power with great responsibilities. When an area is a threat to international peace and security, members of the United Nations and major powers in particular, cannot continue to turn a blind eye to dangerous developments. Thirdly, America has large investments in Southern Africa and has a treaty with Portugal which is one of the major factors responsible for the crisis in this area. It is a matter of decision whether or not the interests of the United States in Portugal weigh more heavily than the interest of building peace on a more stable basis in Southern Africa. Treaty obligations with Portugal, to which Congressman Charles Whalen Jr. referred in his opening remarks, stand in the way of the United States' active participation in the removal of colonialism on the African continent. Indeed the future of the African-American relations will be greatly determined by the United States policy in matters relating to self-determination in Southern Africa. No major power genuinely committed to peace and the welfare of mankind can ignore the unfolding crisis in this part of the world.

Africa need not repeat the assurance given to the white community in Southern Africa

about their future. For nowhere on this continent has an independent African country chosen deliberately to practice reverse racialism after independence. The manifesto on Southern Africa is still on the table. It is not a document of confrontation. It is a challenge to minority regimes and their supporters to work out a just and lasting solution on the basis of equality. We in Zambia hope that the same realization, courage and conviction which have led President Nixon to take concrete steps toward nationalisation of relations with China will inspire America to adopt a more realistic and positive policy towards Africa in general and Southern Africa in particular.

Our task is to build democracy. Our systems of Government may differ because we are all looking for the best solution to problems. Look at the instability which plague Governments which operate under multi-party political systems. A multi-party system is not necessarily the best form of Democratic Government. Let us, therefore, give due weight to the enjoyment of full rights for all law-abiding citizens, but let us not be misled into thinking that this is possible only under one form of democracy. Democracy takes many forms. We therefore need the sympathy and understanding of the American people and the people of the world in our search for the best road to economic and social advancement.

We are partners in building peace and security in the world. The partnership involving a 200 year old America, rich and full of experience, with a ten year old continent of Africa, no doubt demands a lot from the older. But this is natural in many African customs. For in many of our villages, the strong must always help defend the weak. Similarly in our world community, the strong, the well endowed, must be ready to assist the weak in order that the entire community can move forward, matching its aspirations on every turning in peace and freedom.

I am glad that the Agenda of this Conference will cover these issues.

We in Zambia are prepared to co-operate with every nation in the world that is ready to treat us on the basis of equality and respect. There is every reason why we should increase our co-operation with the United States. Our ties are deeply rooted in history, through the presence in that continent of millions of the descendants of Africans with whom we have unbreakable bonds of affinity.

It is my sincere hope that this Conference will make an historic contribution to the American understanding of African problems. We welcome declarations of goodwill and good intentions, of commitment to principles and anti-racialism and to self-determination for the oppressed peoples. Now we need to give concrete expression to our intentions, to our commitments by positive policies.

Let us give substance to the hopes of millions desiring to join the great march to prosperity in freedom. This is the challenge of the United States, Africa and the world. I, therefore, wish the Conference every success in its deliberations.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation calling for a 20-percent increase in social security benefits. My bill—its provisions are substantively identical to the ones sought by Congressman WILBUR MILLS, chairman of

the Ways and Means Committee, in his bill H.R. 13320—recognizes the plight of America's elderly.

Every time the cost of living inches upward, millions of the elderly are driven deeper into poverty. Nearly 25 percent of them, 5 million people, now exist on incomes that fall below what the Census Bureau terms the "poverty line"—\$2,328 for a family, \$1,953 for a person living alone. More than 20 percent live on incomes that just barely edge above the poverty line. And virtually all of them must live more frugally than at any time in recent memory.

H.R. 1, the social security and welfare reform bill that passed the House last year but still awaits action in the Senate, seeks only a trifling 5-percent increase in benefits. Granted, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1 would carry out needed reforms in the administration of social security—increasing benefits for widows, broadening medicare coverage, making possible general increases in benefits every time inflation pushes up the cost of living.

But the 5-percent immediate increase sought in H.R. 1, a modest increase when it was first considered a year ago, now hardly constitutes any increase at all: it would merely make social security benefits commensurate with the price increases that have taken place since January 1971, the effective date of the last increase in benefits.

My bill proposes a full 20-percent increase effective June 1972, raising the minimum monthly social security check from \$70.40 to \$84.50.

Chairman MILLS estimates that this legislation would increase average benefits from \$133 to \$162 for retired workers, from \$222 to \$269 for aged couples, from \$114 to \$153 for aged widows.

The best actuarial data now available, Chairman MILLS points out, indicates that these increases can be financed without any upward change in the current 4.6-percent contribution rate for employees and employers. Indeed, the contribution rates may even be lowered.

Our commitment to the elderly—and to the millions of widows, children, and disabled now sheltered by social security—must be honored.

I hope my colleagues will join me in urging the earliest possible action on this bill.

A NATIONAL RESEARCH PROGRAM TO COMBAT HEROIN ADDICTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday House and Senate conferees met for the first time to consider what could well be one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before this Congress now or in the near future. The legislation to create the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention was passed unanimously by both the Senate and the House of Representatives. Now the conferees will work out the differences between H.R. 12089 and S. 2097 to assure that a central, comprehensive, and coordinated Federal effort will be directed

at combating the national drug abuse problem.

The Select Committee on Crime has long maintained an interest in combating drug addiction. In November 1971 we presented to the Congress the committee's fourth report dealing with this subject. The report, "A National Research Program To Combat the Heroin Addiction Crisis" contained a proposal, later cosponsored by 106 Members of Congress, calling for emergency funds of up to \$50 million for scientific research to create a drug that would effectively treat, prevent, or cure heroin addiction.

Response from Governors, mayors, and other government officials, pharmaceutical companies, and the scientific community overwhelmingly supports such an all-out research effort.

We recognize, as do some of those who have written us, that fighting drug abuse requires a comprehensive approach that includes everything from the need for full employment to basic research into the psychological and physiological causes of addiction, to community-based treatment and rehabilitation programs. Our goal is to give those in the field more tools, that is to say, a greater variety of approaches in preventing, treating, and curing heroin addiction.

Below are reprinted some of the letters we have received from Governors. In the days to come we will submit additional letters from others who have expressed interest in our efforts:

ALBANY, N.Y.
February 10, 1972.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Chairman, Select Committee on Crime,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CLAUDE: Thank you for your recent letter concerning the Select Committee's proposal for a special fund of \$50 million to conduct emergency scientific research to find and develop a non-addictive, safe, long-lasting drug to combat heroin addiction.

I was pleased to note that the Committee's excellent report recorded public urging that such research have the same priority as the Manhattan Project. I have said repeatedly, in a December article for the New York Law Journal, and most recently in my Annual Message to the Legislature, that the answer to drug abuse lies in summoning the total commitment America has always demonstrated in times of national crisis, and it, too, called for commitment on the scale of the Manhattan Project.

New York State experts have long agreed that our traditional reliance on the host of psychotherapeutic, social re-integration, etc., programs must be augmented by new and expanded usage of chemical therapeutic agents. It is for this reason that the state has supported pioneering research in Methadone, and work on antagonists and blocking agents such as that being done by Drs. Alfred Freedman and Max Fink at New York Medical College. In addition, the New York State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission is currently engaged in research on the bio-chemical mechanisms that emerge in response to drug abuse.

Unfortunately, as your Committee documented so appropriately, these notable efforts are severely restricted by a lack of funds, a lack of government support, and by the limited capacity to conduct clinical research. Dr. John Adams has noted that this has been especially true at the Lexington facility with respect to the new drugs that can be tested.

There is no question in my mind, after reviewing the responses of the drug industry to your questionnaire, that our private drug industry has the requisite capacity and expertise and, importantly, the willingness to conduct this vital research.

The missing ingredient is sponsorship, and I agree with you this must be assumed, without reservation or hesitation, by the federal government and on the scale you propose.

Sincerely,

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

LANSING, MICH.,

January 24, 1972.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Chairman, Select Committee on Crime,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PEPPER: Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the report of your Select Committee on Crime regarding the research program to combat heroin addiction.

In our efforts to combat drug abuse in Michigan, we have placed special emphasis on the need for intensive research. The Lafayette Clinic of Detroit, a state operated research and service facility, has been deeply involved in a wide range of studies related to the problem of opiate addiction. The clinic is currently undertaking a major study on narcotic antagonists. We feel that the effectiveness of such research would be greatly enhanced by the involvement of the drug industry. Therefore, I strongly support the recommendations of the Select Committee on Crime for federal funding of such research by the drug industry.

I would like to suggest, however, that consideration be given to requests developed jointly by private drug firms and facilities such as Lafayette Clinic. I feel that the combined capacity and expertise resulting from such a joint undertaking would greatly increase the probability of success.

I have sent a copy of your committee's report to Dr. J. S. Gottlieb, Director, Lafayette Clinic, with instructions to forward to you any comments or suggestions he may have.

Kind personal regards.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN,
Governor.

ATLANTA, GA.,

February 8, 1972.

Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER,
Chairman, Select Committee on Crime,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PEPPER: Thank you for providing me with a copy of the report and recommendations of the Select Committee on Crime entitled "A National Research Program to Combat the Heroin Addiction Crisis." As you know, I have been vitally concerned about this problem, and in the last few months I have moved in Georgia to develop a statewide treatment program to combat heroin addiction which appears to be beginning to have some impact. I am enclosing a description of this program.

While we have found the use of methadone effective in arresting the personal and social deterioration which heroin addiction causes, I agree with the findings of the committee that a diligent and adequately financed search must continue for improved pharmacological antagonists to heroin. I am pleased to be able to tell you that fundamental research in this area is currently being conducted here in Atlanta by Dr. Stephen Holtzman, Assistant Professor, Department of Pharmacology, Emory University Medical School. Dr. Holtzman's work has been funded by the National Institute of Mental Health; however, the continuation and expansion of his very significant research is dependent on continuing federal support, including a pending grant application (MH 21699).

Although I feel that this basic research is essential to our eventual victory over the drug abuse problem, I feel we should not lose sight of the social and psychological factors which not only contribute to the development of addiction, but must be dealt with in any effective treatment program. The need for jobs, adequate living facilities and counseling will exist no matter how effective a chemical treatment we obtain. It is apparent that those methadone programs which provide only the drug without the supportive services have only limited success.

I would like to commend the efforts of the Select Committee on Crime, which I believe have been instrumental in focusing national attention in this critical area.

Sincerely,

JIMMY CARTER.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK.,

January 18, 1972.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Chairman, Select Committee on Crime,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PEPPER: Thank you for your letter of December 29, 1971, and the copy of the report entitled "The National Research Program to Combat the Heroin Addiction Crisis", prepared by the Select Committee on Crime. I have reviewed the report and feel that it is an excellent compilation of information on heroin addiction.

Even though the drug problem in Arkansas, especially as related to heroin addiction, has not reached alarming proportions, we recognize the need for increased research aimed toward the development of more effective ways to prevent and treat heroin addiction. We will support your efforts in the introduction of legislation to reach these objectives.

We do not have any accurate or reliable statewide statistics on drug abuse. We are in the process of developing a Plan for a State Drug Abuse Program at this time. One of the Program's objectives will be to gather information related to the nature and extent of the drug abuse problem, inclusive of heroin addiction. I will certainly pass on the information you sent to me with regard to current legislation on heroin addiction to the coordinator of the State Drug Abuse Program, as soon as such a person is named.

We will appreciate your keeping us informed on current developments of the Select Committee on Crime and its activities. We are intensely interested in solving the drug abuse problem not only in our own State, but in the entire nation.

Best wishes to you in your work with this Committee. If we can be of further assistance, do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

DALE BUMPERS.

AUGUSTA, MAINE,

January 7, 1972.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Chairman, Select Committee on Crime,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PEPPER: This is in reply to your letter dated December 29, 1971 requesting comments concerning the report and recommended legislation for a national research program to combat heroin addiction. I agree that we must come up with expanded research efforts to combat the serious problem of heroin addiction. The promise of securing a successful antagonist which will suppress the action of heroin and other opiates in the human body is certainly deserving of financial support.

I believe that the draft legislation, Appendix I to House Report No. 92-678, deserves this serious consideration.

Thank you for sharing this proposal with me. My best wishes to you.

Sincerely,

KENNETH M. CURTIS,
Governor.

JEFFERSON CITY, MO.,

January 12, 1972.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Member of Congress, House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PEPPER: I acknowledge receipt of the report of The Select Committee on Crime (House Report No. 92-678) and have read it with great interest. The situation your Committee has uncovered concerning the primitive state of development of specific pharmacologic approaches to the prevention and treatment of heroin dependence is dismaying and I commend the Committee for the constructive recommendations it has made to remedy this grave deficiency.

The Mallinckrodt Company of St. Louis, Missouri, has long been a leader in the commercial production of narcotics, the opium alkaloids, and methadone, and I am sure possesses the expertise and interest to participate in the research your Committee projects.

The ubiquity of narcotic dependence has not spared the great cities of Missouri, and I am pleased to endorse the implementation of the programs proposed in your Committee's recommendation. A bill to promote research and development of drugs or chemical compounds for use in the cure, prevention or treatment of heroin addiction as appended to the Committee report should be enacted by Congress. The sum of \$50,000,000 recommended is indeed a minuscule amount to combat this national emergency.

Sincerely yours,

WARREN E. HEARNES.

DOVER, DEL.,

January 17, 1972.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Chairman, Select Committee on Crime,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PEPPER: Thank you for your letter of December 29, 1971, concerning the report and recommended legislation on heroin addiction adopted by your Committee.

We in Delaware are, indeed, critically aware of the tremendous magnitude of the heroin addiction problem. The report of your Committee was extremely thorough and thoughtful. I concur with your findings that research in this field is most primitive. The fact that no exhaustive, sustained research effort has taken place bears testimony to the need for such research. Enlisting the aid of private industry utilizing their expertise, equipment, and personnel will broaden the scope of research in a most exciting manner. I am very much in favor of this approach and feel that this could lead to a major breakthrough in the area of heroin addiction control.

Additionally the proposed legislation provides a necessary incentive which, as you note, is lacking in the present research structure.

Sincerely,

RUSSELL W. PETERSON,
Governor.

FRANKFORT, KY.,

February 7, 1972.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Chairman, Select Committee on Crime, House
Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PEPPER: I have reviewed the recommendations for legislation which the Select Committee on Crime has made for initiating a \$50 million emergency research program to find an effective heroin antagonist. Since I am in complete agreement with the degree of emergency that now exists in this Nation with respect to the abuse of narcotics, and the resultant criminal activity, I will support the recommendations of the Select Committee on Crime.

I agree that the utilization of the private sector and their massive resources for drug research as a primary agent to accomplish this emergency search is an excellent idea. Surely a nation and an industry which have

developed so many lifesaving medications can rise to the occasion through development of an agent to end the tragedy of heroin addiction.

Kentucky, as the home state of the federal government's addiction research center, will be pleased to support the expansion of this fine clinical testing facility that is needed and deserved. It is our hope that it, too, may add a significant contribution.

I am certain that the facilities of the University of Kentucky and of the Kentucky Department of Mental Health could be made available to assist in any way possible. Many fine researchers, formerly staff members of the federal addiction research center, have remained in Kentucky and would be potentially available to work in such efforts.

There is clearly a need to break this increasing menace of heroin addiction, and I feel that the Committee and the Federal Congress have proposed the most propitious mechanism for rapidly seeking out an answer to the problem.

Sincerely,

WENDELL H. FORD.

CARSON CITY, NEV.,
February 1, 1972.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Chairman, Select Committee on Crime,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PEPPER: This will respond to your recent letter in which you outlined the critical drug problem which is facing our nation.

With you, I share a deep concern in the ability of our nation and its states to bring this problem under control. I have no doubt that a great social problem exists in America today which is directly associated with the evils of heroin. It appears that the fifty million dollar proposed support for the program detailed by the Select Committee on Crime should be adequate to produce an effective anti-heroin drug. A massive effort must be mounted to deter the use of heroin, and I feel the proposed legislation is worth supporting.

I am also very concerned that an equal amount of effort is not being put forth to support a strong educational preventative drug abuse program throughout the country. I understand that one million dollars would provide the development costs for a good preventative educational package that could be implemented in each state at the elementary and junior high levels. I believe very strongly in the advantage of preventative strategy over rehabilitation strategy.

While your proposed legislation is necessary because too little attention has been directed toward preventative strategy for potential heroin users. I would urge you to consider an equal effort on the part of educational programs.

Thank you for asking me to express my views on this important piece of proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

MIKE O'CALLAGHAN,
Governor of Nevada.

COLUMBUS, OHIO,
February 3, 1972.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Chairman, Select Committee on Crime,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PEPPER: I am privileged to have the opportunity to reply to your inquiry of December 29, 1971, regarding the needs of research into treatment programs capable of controlling and terminating heroin addiction. I offer to you the following suggestions pertinent to the topic under consideration by your committee.

(1) There exists a continuing need for long-term successful, truly rehabilitative treatment of heroin addiction. Such research

should include intensive evaluation of the various social and psychiatric rehabilitative efforts which will allow a person to remain drug-free throughout the remainder of his lifetime. Coupled with this is a need for additional research to develop stabilization methods in addition to Methadone maintenance. Recently efforts have been expended toward a long-term "Methadone-like" substance which could be injected intramuscularly and will hold a person for several days, thus not requiring repetitive daily doses of Methadone. Such a drug in injectable form would also reduce the probability of Methadone reaching the black market. In general, there is a need for additional chemical substances which would serve as antagonists to heroin or would specifically remove the "craving" associated with heroin usage. Such drugs alone are not likely to prove a long-term answer to heroin addiction, but may be important in the stabilization phase pending the successful treatment and rehabilitation of the addict as suggested in the first portion of this letter.

(2) There remains a need for continued careful investigative study into the nature of heroin addiction and the determining factors which bear upon the ultimate variables pertinent to an individual addict. Social, interpersonal, cultural, racial and other variables should be intensively studied with a view toward early identification of the potential addict in order that preventive measures might be applied and/or such appropriate social, medical, or psychological programs as might be useful in preventing persons from reaching the stage of addiction as such.

(3) There is a continuing need for a resolution of the conflict over the relationship between Cannabis and the ultimate addiction to morphine derivatives. We believe that research directed toward this fundamental question would be of immense value and should receive high priority. The investigation of the long-term effects of Cannabis upon the individual in and of its own right also is deserving of considerably enhanced investigative activity. I am aware that Congress, through the National Institute of Mental Health has made funds available for this research, but every evaluation of the extent of the direction of such research programs would be appropriate.

Items 1 and 2 have been addressed in part by already authorized research. I believe substantial additional research must be conducted. The proposal by the Select Committee on Crime to allocate an additional 50 million dollars to fund research for pharmaceutical research on the treatment and cure of heroin addiction is commendable. In addition, I urge research into the other two problem areas cited above.

The people of the State of Ohio are deeply concerned about the inroads of addiction in our state. We estimate there may be between 30,000 and 40,000 addicts within the confines of Ohio. The Department of Mental Hygiene and Correction will be moving rapidly to establish additional treatment and rehabilitation programs, but I fear that we can offer but modest claims for the success of such program. I have recently appointed a Governor's Coordinating Council on Drug Abuse to develop basic policy recommendations for the Governor's Office relating to the prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation of drug offenders and the enforcement of appropriate legal sanctions against the drug abuser and/or the trafficker in drugs. This Committee will also attempt to integrate the education-information programs in the public schools and that presented to the public at large with the other efforts of Ohio to stem the rising tide of drug abuse.

You may be assured of my continued interest in the field of drug abuse. If I, my staff, or staff members of the various departments of State government in Ohio can be of

any assistance to the Committee, you most assuredly may call upon us for any help we may be able to offer.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. GILLIGAN.

HONOLULU, HAWAII,
January 13, 1972.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Chairman, Select Committee on Crime,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PEPPER: This is in reply to your letter of December 29, 1971, forwarding the report of the Select Committee on Crime regarding a national research program to combat the heroin addiction crisis.

We in Hawaii share your concern about this difficult problem. The State of Hawaii has a methadone blockade program which is being operated by the local John Howard Association with partial support from State funds contracted for through our State Department of Health. The material presented in your Committee's report is in consonance with the views of our Department of Health physicians and other personnel who have been concerned with developing approaches to the problem of heroin addiction in Hawaii.

I would agree that present approaches to dealing with this problem are inadequate and that research along the lines your Committee has suggested is very much in order. I feel that your proposal to recommend federal funding in support of such research is most appropriate.

Aloha, and may the Almighty be with you and yours.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BURNS.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH,
January 14, 1972.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Chairman, Select Committee on Crime,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PEPPER: The "National Research Program to Combat the Heroin Addiction Crisis" would receive support from our state. We have methadone programs in the state and realize the need for further research and experimentation in this important area.

We also feel that broader, more comprehensive research into the basic causes of heroin addiction and other drug abuse problems should be encouraged by the Federal government. This research would be aimed primarily at identifying sociological and psychological causes of our national crisis in drug addiction.

We would also support research into other drug free treatment approaches with heroin addiction, such as, therapeutic communities and new forms of therapeutic intervention.

We appreciate the opportunity to respond to your committee on this most important national problem and commend your committee for its interest in obtaining input from the states.

Sincerely yours,

CALVIN L. RAMPTON,
Governor.

BOISE, IDAHO,
January 5, 1972.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Select Committee on Crime,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PEPPER: I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for allowing me to comment upon your Select Committee on Crime program to combat the heroin addiction crisis.

I realize, as do others in my state, that there is an ever increasing problem of drug addiction across our land and I find the need for a new drug to combat the disease of heroin addiction most urgent.

I have found that in Idaho the problem

of heroin addiction is not as common as in other states. However, I consider any case of addiction as being detrimental not only to the individual involved, but also to his local, state, and national government.

We are concerned, and would appreciate being kept up-to-date on further developments.

Sincerely,

CECIL D. ANDRUS,
Governor.

COLUMBIA, S.C.,
January 24, 1972.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Chairman, Select Committee on Crime,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PEPPER: I am responding to your letter dated December 29th asking for my evaluation of your Committee's proposal for long range research geared toward developing alternatives to our present drug treatment programs. The heroin addiction problem has been given considerable attention in South Carolina, and we realize the need for such activity.

We have recently discussed and are continuing to develop a program which will allow our State to exercise strict control over the use of the drug methadone. I, personally, believe that methadone has a place at the present time in the treatment of heroin addiction. However, the possibility of indiscriminate prescription greatly concerns me, and we are prepared to address ourselves to this problem.

I have read your report and strongly endorse the proposed program. If we may be of any further assistance to you please do not hesitate to let us know.

Sincerely,

JOHN C. WEST,
Governor.

ANNAPOLIS, Md.,
January 17, 1972.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Chairman, Select Committee on Crime,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PEPPER: Thank you for sending me a copy of your Committee's report on heroin addiction research.

I heartily concur in your recommendation to step up funding for research in this area. The problem is one of frightening dimensions and we desperately need solutions.

Since my expertise in this field is limited, I have asked the State Drug Abuse Administration to examine your report and forward to you their conclusions.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely,

MARVIN MANDEL,
Governor.

RICHMOND, Va.,
February 14, 1972.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PEPPER: I support any worthwhile approach to alleviating drug addiction, and I have recommended legislation similar to that of your Committee which would authorize the necessary medical research to help in the treatment programs to control heroin addiction in Virginia.

As you are aware the most prevalent treatment now available to heroin addicts is methadone, a substitute drug but one which is also addictive and consequently subject to abuse. The problems of methadone abuse and/or addiction were recently called to my attention by the Virginia Council on Narcotics and Drug Abuse Control and we feel we have found ways to control many of them.

In Richmond, for example, a methadone program which is a pilot project, has operated for twenty consecutive months without

incident of death or overdose. This project has had over 600 patients and keeps an active patient load of approximately 300 people. We use very close controls and some new innovative approaches in the dispensing of substitute drugs and in working with drug abusers. The legislation I have recommended to the General Assembly in the 1972 biennium would enact these controls on a statewide basis for all drug substitution programs and would give the Commonwealth adequate funding to expand these programs to offer their services throughout Virginia.

I have also recommended the expenditure of substantial State funds to assist in combatting drug abuse not only in the area of addiction, but also through education and the criminal justice system. I believe our drug abuse program must be broadly based, and it must touch all areas of need.

Best wishes.

Cordially,

LINWOOD HOLTON.

CHEYENNE, WYO.,
January 20, 1972.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PEPPER: Thank you for your letter of December 29, 1971 and the accompanying report of your Committee on the National Research Program to Combat the Heroin Addiction Crises.

The overall problem of drug addiction is a very real concern to me. The Wyoming Legislature recently passed a Uniform Controlled Substances Act which is being administered by the Wyoming Attorney General. Our State Health Department is working on the rehabilitative side of the program and our State Education Department is spearheading a preventive education program.

I don't believe that any of us have the answer to the drug problem but we are working on a coordinated approach and program of prevention thorough law enforcement and education and rehabilitation of those who have already become victims of drug addiction.

We in Wyoming support your efforts to establish a National Research Program to Combat Heroin Addiction. With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

STAN HATHAWAY.

MATZOH MAIL-IN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MINISH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to invite—nay, urge—our colleagues in the Congress to participate in a unique project sponsored by the New Jersey Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. It is a truly worthy cause and one in which Americans of all faiths and races should join, evoking as it does our national aspirations of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for mankind.

The project conceived by the league calls for the mailing of 1-pound boxes of matzoh to the Soviet Ambassador in Washington on March 17. The matzoh mailing on March 17 will insure that arrival of all the boxes will be at approximately the same date, in advance of Passover, March 29. Mailing labels will be gladly supplied by Mr. Robert C. Kohler, regional director of the New Jersey regional office, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 24 Com-

merce Street, Newark, N.J. 07102; Market 3-6241. The label bears the inscription:

This matzoh, the symbol of freedom for 3,200 years, now symbolizes hope for 3-million Jews of the Soviet Union, and reminds you that freedom-loving Americans stand with them in their struggle. Free the Prisoners—Let My People Go.

The project, which is described in detail in the following articles, is a symbolic protest against the harassment—and worse—of Soviet Jews. "Free the prisoners—let my people go"—is no idle slogan. The participation of Americans of all races and creeds in the project will not go unheeded by the Soviet authorities.

I should like to insert at this point in the RECORD two stories, dated February 3 and February 9, 1972, from the Newark Star Ledger, and an editorial from the Bergen-Record of February 7:

MATZOH "MAIL-IN" PROPOSED TO SUPPORT Jews IN SOVIET UNION (By Ellice Gilmour)

New Jersey's Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith has a dream.

It begins with thousands of boxes of matzoh piled up in Washington's Soviet embassy and culminates in an end to "the tyranny of imprisonment of 3 million Jews" in the USSR.

Yesterday the league took the first step towards realization of that dream as officials issued a plea to Jerseyans to mail one-pound boxes of matzoh—unleavened bread, the symbol of freedom to Jewish people—to Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin in Washington.

"We are urging all Jews and non-Jews to join us in this symbolic protest to remind the Soviets that our brethren are not forgotten by us," said New Jersey Regional Director Robert C. Kohler in issuing the plea.

The group is asking residents to mail the matzoh on March 17 so that arrival of all the boxes will be at approximately the same date. Expected arrival would be sometime before Passover, March 29.

Passover commemorates the Jews' flight from Egyptian bondage some 3,200 years ago. Matzoh was the unleavened bread the people ate as they fled their oppressors.

The league is issuing suggested labels that read:

"This matzoh, the symbol of freedom for 3,200 years, now symbolizes hope for 3 million Jews of the Soviet Union, and reminds you that freedom-loving Americans stand with them in their struggle.

They have requested all boxes be marked with the slogan "Free the Prisoners—Let My People Go."

The league said they expect full cooperation from Jerseyans because "we know people sympathize with the plight of Soviet Jews, but they do not know how to express this. Not many people will march at the Russian embassy, but they will spend 50 cents for a box of matzoh."

"Our far-reaching goals are to free Jewish prisoners who have been incarcerated on trumped-up charge and see that Jews are free to leave the Soviet Union for Israel," said Joseph Katz, vice chairman. "But immediately we want to effect an outpouring of American sentiment so that when Nixon visits the Soviet Union they will know this is top priority."

Kohler did not feel this action would promote additional harassment of Soviet Jews, but, he said, that was always a chance.

"An ostrich never got anywhere," he commented. "We must act."

In making the plea, the league issued formal denunciation of militant action for the

cause of Soviet Jewry, specifically singling out the Jewish Defense League.

The league will request the matzoh be forwarded to Soviet Union for distribution and, if the embassy will not supply the flight, the league will.

"If the plane is supplied by us, it will carry the slogan 'Free the Prisoners—Let My People Go,'" Katz said.

The possibility that the matzohs will not be accepted by the embassy remains.

In the event this happens the league has arranged for trucks to pick up the boxes for distribution to hospitals, old-age homes and charities in the Washington area.

The mailing address for the boxes is:

Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin, Embassy of the U.S.S.R., 1706 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

CHURCH COUNCIL IN JERSEY JOINS MATZOH "MAIL-IN"

(By Ellice Gilmour)

The New Jersey Council of Churches, which has a membership of 3,000 congregations representing 11 denominations, has joined its "Jewish brothers and sisters in behalf of all the world's oppressed people" in the recently launched "Matzoh of Hope" project.

Sponsored by New Jersey's Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the campaign asks persons of all faiths to mail boxes of matzoh, marked clearly with the words "Free the Prisoners—Let My People Go," to the Soviet ambassador in Washington on March 17.

The idea is to flood the embassy office with the unleavened bread—the symbol of freedom to Jewish people—during the week which precedes both Passover and the Christian holy week.

The project was launched with the ultimate goal of freeing Jewish prisoners now held in Soviet prisons on "trumped-up charges" and to see that Jews are free to leave the country to live in Israel, or in the country of their choice.

In endorsing the project and announcing plans to send leaflets explaining it to its 3,000 members, Rev. Paul Staag, president of the council, said he hoped the membership would pick up the drive on the local level by holding matzoh wrapping sessions and joining synagogues in marches to post offices to mail the boxes.

"We're glad to join in this rather creative opportunity to cry out against oppression, which we deplore whether it be against the black or hispanic people of this country or the Jewish people of the Soviet Union," Staag said.

The sponsors have timed the project so that arrival will come in time for Passover, Mar. 29, which commemorates the Hebrews' flight from Egyptian bondage.

The league is issuing labels that read:

"This matzoh, the symbol of freedom for 3,200 years, now symbolizes hope for 3 million Jews of the Soviet Union and reminds you that freedom-loving Americans stand with them in their struggle."

The league plans to request the matzoh be forwarded to Jews in the Soviet Union and, if the embassy will not provide transportation, they say they will get their own planes.

"If we fly them in, the plane will carry the slogan 'Free the Prisoners—Let My People Go,'" a league representative said in making the announcement.

The possibility the embassy will not accept delivery has been considered and the league has volunteer trucks standing by to deliver the matzoh to orphanages, old age homes, hospitals and charities in the Washington area if need be.

The mailing address for the boxes is:

Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin, Embassy of the U.S.S.R., 1706 18th St., N.W., Washington, DC 20009

MATZOH TO MR. DOBRYNIN

An ingenious gadget for applying political pressure has been invented in New Jersey, mother of so many technological breakthroughs, by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. It has appealed to Jerseymen to mail one-pound boxes of matzoh—the unleavened bread of the Passover and the exodus to freedom—to the Soviet Russian ambassador in Washington. The league is distributing labels that will explain to Ambassador Dobrynin:

"This matzoh, the symbol of freedom for 3,200 years, now symbolizes hope for three million Jews of the Soviet Union and reminds you that freedom-loving Americans stand with them in their struggle."

"Free the Prisoners—Let My People Go!" is another legend ADL organizers ask Jews and non-Jews to affix to the packages.

The ADL is laboring under no delusion that the people in the Kremlin, staggered on learning that folks in New Jersey feel so strongly about post-Czar anti-Semitism, will reconsider their imprisonment of Jews in state prisons or in the prison that is Russia itself. The pressure is not on Brezhnev and Kosygin. It is on President Nixon, who will understand the meaning of the matzoh though Dobrynin doesn't—and who in due time will have a chance to mention the subject to his opposite numbers at summit No. 2.

No harm can be done. If Dobrynin won't fly the matzoh to Russia for distribution, the ADL will offer its own plane. If it can't get clearance for its plane it will distribute the matzoh to hospitals, old-age homes, and charities in and around Washington. The Kremlin may little note or long remember. United States officials in the White House and the Department of State might be impressed if the product is impressive. Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin's mailing address is the Embassy of the U.S.S.R., 1706 18th St. NW., Washington, D.C., 20009.

CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF HOLBROOK, MASS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues in the House some of the press reports of the 100th anniversary celebration of the town of Holbrook, Mass., on February 29. Also, because of the importance of the town as the original shoe city of Massachusetts and the various changes in fortune which have befallen it since then, I thought the Members of the House would find particularly interesting my comments delivered on that occasion as they relate to the situation currently prevailing in the Greater Brockton area. The future prosperity of hundreds of areas such as this throughout the country depend upon what action Congress will take in reforming its current trade policies.

The reports follow:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN JAMES A. BURKE BEFORE THE TOWN OF HOLBROOK ON THE OCCASION OF THE TOWN'S 100TH CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

Members of the board of selectmen, distinguished members of the School Committee, reverend clergy, ladies and gentlemen, my good friends of Holbrook. I do not think there is anything which quite pleases a public official as much as the thought that he is playing a role in history, a part of history in the making. Now, historic occasions are

not all that easy to come by. Consequently, I was most honored and deeply touched when I received the invitation from the chairman of your board of selectmen to be the principal speaker on this most festive occasion. The banquet celebrating the 100th anniversary of the town of Holbrook. Today, exactly 100 years ago, the governor of the commonwealth signed into law the bill creating the town of Holbrook after an intensive and oftentimes disappointing campaign by the residents of what then was East Randolph to have an identity of their own.

Countless individuals contributed no small amount of energy into making Holbrook the great town that it is today, the overwhelming majority of whom were not powerful, rich, or famous, but rather hardworking, earnest citizens endowed with a tremendous pride in their community. Probably the most famous man associated with the town in its history is the gentleman whose name the town bears; and yet, if I may make the suggestion, it probably was the town which made his name so well known rather than the other way around. Elisha Holbrook, in his civic-mindedness, in his willingness to part with fortune and risk his reputation demonstrated the sort of total commitment to a cause which more and more today we are coming to appreciate: a dedication to civic betterment, a commitment to government at the local level with active community participation and a willingness to part with some of one's resources in order to make the local community a better place in which to work and live. Holbrook never lived to see his dream come true. As a matter of fact, even before the town was given its charter, rumors circulated to the effect that Holbrook's generous offer of \$50,000 to get the town started on its way was predicated on the town being named after him. Historians, however, then and since have denied this was the cause, but I mention it because I think it so well illustrates the risks anyone getting involved in community affairs is running. There will always be rumors and those who see nothing but selfishness and ambition in even the most civic-minded gestures and dedication to the public good. That has been one of the prices men have paid since time immemorial for taking an active role in the body politic. Holbrook apparently was no exception.

The feeling of history in the making may possibly have been underscored at the time of the town's inception by the fact that one, John Adams, the grand nephew of the great John Adams, played an important role in the fight which led to incorporation and served on the town's first board of selectmen in 1872. His participation served to underscore the continuing tradition of involvement in local affairs by members of the Adams family in these here parts. His grandfather, John Adams' brother, Captain Elihu Adams commanded a company of Minutemen from here and in fact, was one of those who gave their lives for the colonies during the siege of Boston by the British. I, myself, as Holbrook's Congressman in Washington occupy the seat represented on several occasions by one Adams or another, at one stage of Holbrook's history or another.

However, aside from one or two families such as Holbrook or Adams, this speech is not going to be too much of a "let us praise famous men" speech. The fact is that the town has grown and prospered over the past 100 years because of the efforts of many too numerous to mention and too humble to be famous. One or two people cannot take all the credit in the case of this town, and that is probably the way it should be anyway. In any event, this suits my purposes very well this evening. One-hundredth anniversaries are tailor-made opportunities for reflecting on the accomplishments of the past and gaining inspirations for the future. As I see it, the town of Holbrook in common with the rest

of the 11th Congressional District and indeed Massachusetts and New England is at a crossroad in history which requires our full attention. In particular, Holbrook and the 11th District and Massachusetts and New England are at an important crossroad in the area's economic history, testing whether this town or this area or this region of the Nation can continue to engage in productive employment. In reviewing the past of Holbrook in an effort to get ideas for the future, I discovered that to some extent the problems we face today are familiar ones to this town. You have been living with some of the problems affecting the surrounding communities almost from your inception, 100 years ago. I found that this town is no stranger to unemployment and what can happen when plants close down and workers lose their jobs. During the Civil War, four major establishments were engaged in turning out thousands of pairs of shoes for the U.S. Government. Business continued to prosper long after the war was finished. By 1878, after you were incorporated, 18 firms were engaged in this business; by 1883 total boot and shoe shipments from Holbrook amounted to 75,826 cases—no small accomplishment for that time. This was then for the first decade of its existence, a prosperous thriving community with plenty of work for everyone and a nationwide market for its handiwork. In fact, you could say that the town was born under the most auspicious of circumstances—almost with a silver spoon in its mouth. And then, troubles began to appear on the horizon as competition from another town appeared—ironically with a major assist from a native of this town, a Micah Faxon, who bears the dubious honor as far as Holbrook is concerned, as the first person to set up a manufacturing shop in the city of Brockton.

By 1910, according to the town's historian, Holbrook's great era of industrial activity ceased to exist. Aside from taking perhaps some satisfaction in giving birth to one of the great industries in New England, the leather and footwear industry, there was little else left for Holbrook to do as workers looked to Brockton for employment and increasingly the town became little more than a bedroom community for industry in surrounding cities and towns.

Now, I spend time dwelling on this aspect of the town's history not because I wanted to bring up such unpleasant subjects on such a happy occasion, but because there are important warnings for all of us in what happened to Holbrook in the past. Fortunately for this town it made the adjustment to the loss of industry. After some time and as transportation improved, its residents were able to find work elsewhere. But, make no mistake about it, this process was not without its painful readjustment and the town was lucky in that Brockton was reasonably close and could use for a long time its skills in shoe manufacturing. But today, what happened in your town over 50 years ago is already underway with a vengeance in other communities close by. The city of Brockton, which took over from this town and went on to become the shoe capital of the country, and a vital source of much of the economic health in this area, has been going through a difficult period of late, with numerous shoe plants closing their doors, workers increasingly unemployed, exhausting their unemployment benefits and turning to welfare. New industries which were supposed to be the salvation of the future which sprang up around Boston after the last war and during the Korean conflict, too, have fallen on hard times. The electronics industry, the data processing and computer industries, whether defense, N.A.S.A. or privately oriented, have all experienced days of famine. The result is that route 128, in former times pointed to with pride as Massachusetts' showcase of the future, is now a disaster area, in many respects, of high unemployment which cuts across the board, affecting as it does not only

the blue collar workers but high salaried, highly educated white collar workers as well.

To some extent, some of the difficulties we are experiencing lately result from the general economic slow down affecting our whole economy from coast to coast. Thousands of workers are out of jobs in every state in the union. However, if that were the case the solution to our problem might not be too long in coming. Eventually everyone knows the national economy will have to recover and experience an upturn. What bothers me and many others familiar with the situation in Massachusetts—in Brockton, in Avon, in Randolph, in Holbrook, in Boston—is that we were in trouble before the rest of the economy and our trouble seems to be more deep-rooted than the general economic slow-down the whole country is experiencing. I know this town will understand what I am saying when I say that New England is probably the oldest region in the country and was the first to experience the industrial revolution. This town does not have to look to the textile mills of John Slater in Rhode Island to know what an industrial revolution is all about. Around 1800 one of your townsmen erected the first shop in America for the manufacture of machine made nails.

In 1838, another one of your townsmen, Captain Ezra Thayer, was the first in the nation to manufacture leather shoe strings. It was in this town that boots were first machine stitched, one of the first commercial applications of the then new sewing machine. Advances like this played a vital role in giving New England a head start in this country's industrialization. As this town so well knows, however, being in on the ground floor sometimes can turn out to be a disadvantage as other cities and towns come along with newer plants, more modern equipment, and, in the case of the south, lower taxes and little in the way of labor legislation.

What we are confronted with today in New England and in the Nation increasingly, is not, however, just competition from the city down the road, like Brockton or Randolph, in days of old. In fact, New England's big problem is no longer competition from cheap southern labor and hardly any taxes down south. Today our problem is coming from overseas. It is foreign factories which are flooding our domestic markets with shoes produced at unbelievably low wages, with textiles produced at even lower wages and with electrical and technical equipment produced at practically slave wages. Whether these foreign manufacturers are American owned or foreign owned, the point remains that plant after plant in this country is discovering it just cannot compete with such wages. What is happening, therefore, is that this area with such a heavy stake in the textile, leather goods, and electrical industries is being confronted with a continuing national trend toward increased imports and reduced exports. Unlike the situation this town experienced and Massachusetts experienced when the textile mills moved to the south, we cannot even take comfort in the fact that at least some other section of the country is prospering and raising their standard of living which in turn will make us a healthier national economy. What we are witnessing is the loss of jobs overseas. All of us, I am sure, knew of textile workers and shoe workers who went out west or down south in search of jobs when things got tough after the war, but these people cannot go to Europe or Asia in search of these jobs. That is why I have said all along that the economists that advocate that this country should do nothing to protect its workers, spend time to encourage new industries to take the place of old ones are victims of an attitude that made sense perhaps 20 or 30 years ago, but no longer has much relevance to what is going on today. It is all well and good to tell someone across the street to wait and some other job might turn up in the future. It is a different story when your job

has been phased out and your plant is closed down. What industries are we waiting for to take the place of the ones closed down? The electronics industry was supposed to be the new hope for Massachusetts and the Nation, the newest industry to come along in years.

In a matter of years, the orientals have proven that they can catch up very quickly, especially when Americans companies are willing to report the necessary machinery and capital goods and money to get them started. What they have and we will never have, of course, is cheap foreign labor and I mean cheap. We are not talking about a 25¢ wage difference, we are talking about child labor, women working seven days a week, wages of 15 to 20¢ an hour. Why, you would have to repeal the child labor law, return to the sweat shop and the 8 day work week in this country. In other words, wipe out the achievements of the past 50 years in order to meet this kind of competition. I do not think any American manufacturer or worker who seriously examines the competitive situation today can help but conclude that something must be done and done soon to change this Nation's whole trade policy.

Now, I did not come up here tonight to use the occasion of your 100th anniversary to push for any piece legislation. All I am trying to do in filing my bill is to get the attention of the administration, the Commerce Department, and the Tariff Commission and the multinational corporations who act as if there are no problems at home and that they can look forward to years of free trade and business as usual. The longer it takes for these people to realize that we do not have free trade today, that what we have today is a one-way street with all the foreign imports coming this way and the only thing being sold overseas machinery and heavy equipment to get new factories started up overseas to compete with ours. The sooner they realize the tremendous maize of restrictions and barriers to our exports in practically every foreign country we do business in—the sooner they realize that this country just cannot afford to become a totally service-oriented economy, selling life insurance policies to each other, then the sooner something will be done and the medicine will not have to be as strong as it will be if we wait much longer. I am a free trader by nature and by training, but I am also a realist who senses that something is seriously wrong with our economy today. I am also the Congressman who is representing the 11th Congressional District from Massachusetts which includes towns like Holbrook, Randolph, Avon, Whitman and Abington, as well as cities like Quincy, Brockton, and Boston, all of whom have been hard hit by increasing unemployment and closing down of plants. I cannot ignore my mail and the agonizing pleas of the unemployed shoe workers, electronics workers, technical workers, textile workers—none of whom have much confidence in the future if things are allowed to continue as they are. I think it is time we spend more money on updating plants in this country, instead of overseas and attempt to regulate the avalanche of imports pouring into our economy, before many more months of balance of trade deficits go by. It is all well and good to be a residential community and Holbrook has prospered in this role for much of its past, but all residential communities, when you come right down to it, depend on a healthy area economy. Right now, we are at a turning point which will determine how prosperous our next 100 years will be. When you read, then, of some of the statements in the papers, in the weeks and months ahead about this trade controversy, I hope that you will remember some of the past of your own town and some of what I have told you tonight. If I were not alive to the problems we are facing and doing my part to call the Nation's attention to them, then I would not want to be this town's representative in

Washington as you begin your second century as a community.

HOLBROOK'S 25TH BIRTHDAY SWINGS HUNDREDFOLD

Holbrook is a Leap Year baby and like all babies born on Feb. 29, it only gets a chance to celebrate its birthdate every four years.

So, when 500 residents gathered at the high school last night for the town's 100th anniversary—and simultaneous 25th birthday party—they did it with four times the enthusiasm.

How does a town feel about being "born" on Leap Year Day? Maybe the same way Holbrook-born Mrs. Charlotte Miles feels.

"As a child I resented being born on Feb. 29, but now I don't feel so old," said Mrs. Miles. She celebrated her 12th birthday last night.

Holbrook was incorporated in 1872 but citizens have only been able to throw 25 parties. Because of this, however, residents have learned to make the most of them.

"We really whooped it up," said Frank McLaughlin, chairman of the Board of Selectmen. "The people of Holbrook are proud of their town and they show it."

Town historian Wesley Cote traced the town's history from the days when it was a part of Braintree and Randolph and a shoe-town to its present status as a "fine residential community" and suburb of Boston.

Festively clad citizens swapped "Happy Birthday" greetings as young and old gathered to toast. A roast beef dinner was complete from fresh fruit slices to the assorted ice cream.

Guest speaker for the anniversary was U.S. Rep. James A. Burke of the 11th Congressional District.

HOLBROOK HAS 100TH BIRTHDAY PARTY

Holbrook . . . A gala banquet was held here last evening to celebrate its 100th anniversary.

Over 500 residents and invited guests were present at the high school to honor the town on this festive occasion.

Much of the credit for the outstanding dinner and entertainment must go to centennial chairman Charlotte Stanley and her chairman for this event, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Moran.

The guest speaker was James Burke, Congressman for the town.

He offered congratulations and urged continual vigilance in continuing to make Holbrook a great town, in the face of many problems which the town has overcome in the past and might continue to bear in the future.

Many other dignitaries at the banquet included State Senator Arthur Tobin, D-Quincy, State Representative, Donald Laing, R-Braintree, who brought greetings from Gov. Sargent, Representative William Dignat, D-Braintree, who offered the congratulations of the General Court.

Barry Hannon, Register of Deeds; Bennett McLaughlin, Register of Probate and resident of the town; Mr. and Mrs. Frederick Lutz, Sen. Alan MacKinnon D-Weymouth;

and representing Republican Senator Edward Brooke was Atty. Andrew Card. John Weaver of Holbrook read greetings from Sen. Edward Kennedy.

Wesley Cole, the town historian, gave a brief history of the town from its earliest settlers to its final incorporation.

The official opening for the banquet was given by Selectman John Spillane.

Father Charles B. Murphy of St. Joseph's Church gave the invocation and Rev. E. Robert Dickson the benediction.

Entertainment was supplied by Charles Dornan, a former Holbrook resident, who regaled townspeople with reminiscences of Holbrook as it was.

A rousing rendition of the Charles Sumner "fight song" was sung by the many graduates of that school.

References to movies at the town hall, trips to the Metropolitan Theatre, "Woofie" McPherson and his haircuts, trips home from Boston on the old train brought back fond memories of Holbrook "a few years back."

The creative art work, which transformed old postcards of a by-gone era, into giant-sized posters, was done by the art students of Robert Kindelan of the high school. Students who contributed special talents were Lynn Anastasio, Robert Peter, William Wash, Diane Persampieri, Rhonda Brownell, William Calhoun, Ruth Hayes, Claudia Koeppel, Marie Land, Terry Moores, and Joyce Maloney.

The decorations were supervised by Edith Bowers and Marie Baker.

The centennial week celebration will continue with three balls on Saturday evening. At that time a centennial queen will be chosen to reign over upcoming events.

MISSISSIPPI'S THIRD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GRIFFIN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my honor and privilege to serve as U.S. Representative from Mississippi's Third Congressional District for nearly 4 years. During that time, I have supported programs and policies, within the framework of our Constitution, that I felt to be beneficial to my district, State, and Nation.

The Third Congressional District of Mississippi is one of the most diversified in the United States. We are bounded on the west by the Mississippi River and on the east by the Pearl River with the exception of a portion of Walthall County, on the north by Madison, Yazoo, and Issaquena Counties; and on the south by the Louisiana line.

We have oil and gas production, dairy production, poultry, vegetables, grain, and cotton. We have delta, hills, and

prairie. Forestry and forest products are prime industries. Financial and commercial services employ thousands.

In the 12 counties, we have plantations, family farms, ranches, and the largest urban center in Mississippi. Jackson, the State capital, is in our district.

The Third District has had a prominent place in the history of Mississippi and the South.

Adams County was the first Mississippi County to organize in the Mississippi Territory, in 1798, and was named for President John Adams.

Amite County was first organized in the Mississippi Territory in 1809, and was named for the Indian word which means "Friendly River."

Claiborne County was organized as a territorial county in 1802 and is named for William C. C. Claiborne, Territorial Governor of Mississippi.

Copiah County was formed in 1823, 6 years after Mississippi was admitted to the Union. It is named for the Indian name meaning "Calling Panther."

Franklin County was organized as a territorial county in 1809 and is named for Benjamin Franklin.

Hinds County was formed in 1821 and is named for Gen. Thomas Hinds, hero of the Battle of New Orleans.

Jefferson County, named for President Thomas Jefferson, was first organized in the Mississippi Territory in 1802.

Lincoln County was formed in 1870 and was named for Abraham Lincoln, our 16th President of the United States.

Pike County was organized in 1815 in the Mississippi Territory and was named for Gen. Zebulon Pike, an Army commander and explorer.

Walthall County is the youngest county in our district, having been formed in 1910. It is named for Edward C. Walthall, a Mississippi soldier and statesman.

Warren County was first organized in the Mississippi Territory in 1809. It is named for Joseph Warren, hero of the Revolutionary War.

Wilkinson County was first organized in the Mississippi Territory in 1802 and is named for Gen. James Wilkinson.

In these 12 counties in southwest Mississippi live many people whose ancestors settled in Mississippi during colonial times. Many others were born elsewhere, but have chosen to make their home and their life in this section of the great State of Mississippi. The 1970 census revealed that 444,704 persons live in the Third District. At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I insert a population table by county, sex, race, and age.

1970 POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS, 3D CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, MISSISSIPPI¹

| County | Total | White | | Negro | | Both races | |
|-----------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------------|------------|
| | | Male | Female | Male | Female | Age 18 and over | Median age |
| Adams | 37,293 | 9,262 | 10,104 | 8,149 | 9,716 | 22,459 | 25.4 |
| Amite | 13,763 | 3,371 | 3,443 | 3,383 | 3,559 | 8,234 | 26.2 |
| Claiborne | 10,086 | 1,240 | 1,296 | 3,417 | 4,105 | 6,295 | 22.8 |
| Copiah | 24,749 | 5,900 | 6,398 | 5,899 | 6,538 | 15,367 | 26.4 |
| Franklin | 8,011 | 2,385 | 2,512 | 1,489 | 1,620 | 5,169 | 31.3 |
| Hinds | 214,973 | 61,915 | 68,677 | 39,204 | 44,860 | 134,984 | 24.9 |
| Jefferson | 9,295 | 1,106 | 1,190 | 3,341 | 3,555 | 5,320 | 22.5 |
| Lincoln | 26,198 | 8,789 | 9,349 | 3,793 | 4,242 | 16,690 | 28.0 |
| Pike | 31,756 | 8,492 | 9,411 | 6,581 | 7,246 | 19,410 | 28.4 |
| Walthall | 12,500 | 3,634 | 3,769 | 2,421 | 2,667 | 7,765 | 27.7 |
| Warren | 44,981 | 12,729 | 13,745 | 8,361 | 9,994 | 27,719 | 26.7 |
| Wilkinson | 11,099 | 1,748 | 1,840 | 3,602 | 3,897 | 6,499 | 24.1 |

¹Sum of columns do not equal total column because races other than white and Negro are excluded.

The Census Bureau has classified our district's population as being 58.4 percent urban.

According to census figures, approximately 25,000 young persons 18 to 21 will be eligible to vote for the first time in this year's elections in the Third District. I am confident that these young people will exercise mature judgment in the voting booth after full study of the candidates and issues.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I insert a table prepared by the Bureau of Census which reflects population, housing, and election statistics of the entire State of Mississippi and the Third Congressional District:

MISSISSIPPI—CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT DATA,
92D CONGRESS

| Item | State total | 3d |
|--|-------------|----------|
| POPULATION, 1970 | | |
| Total | 2,216,912 | 444,704 |
| Percent change, 1960-70 | 1.8 | 3.8 |
| Percent of State total | 100.0 | 20.1 |
| Per square mile | 46.8 | 62.9 |
| White | 1,393,283 | 252,305 |
| Negro | 815,770 | 191,739 |
| Other | 7,859 | 660 |
| Percent Negro and other | 37.2 | 43.3 |
| Male | 1,074,217 | 210,519 |
| Female | 1,142,695 | 234,185 |
| Urban | 986,642 | 259,618 |
| Percent of total | 44.5 | 58.4 |
| Rural | 1,230,270 | 185,086 |
| Metropolitan | 393,488 | 214,973 |
| Inside central cities | 243,245 | 153,968 |
| Outside central cities | 150,243 | 61,005 |
| Nonmetropolitan | 1,823,424 | 229,731 |
| Under 5 years | 209,606 | 40,162 |
| 5 to 13 years | 439,255 | 88,567 |
| 14 to 17 years | 194,906 | 39,364 |
| 18 to 20 years | 130,180 | 25,569 |
| 21 years and over | 1,242,965 | 251,042 |
| 21 to 24 years | 132,161 | 25,496 |
| 25 to 34 years | 242,646 | 49,463 |
| 35 to 44 years | 223,597 | 46,965 |
| 45 to 64 years | 422,241 | 86,204 |
| 65 years and over | 222,320 | 42,914 |
| Median age: | | |
| Total population (years) | 25.1 | 25.6 |
| Voting age population (years) | 46.1 | 45.8 |
| Population in group quarters | 57,692 | 9,114 |
| Inmates of institutions | 16,307 | 2,277 |
| HOUSING, 1970 | | |
| All housing units | 699,150 | 141,257 |
| All year-round housing units | 697,094 | 141,152 |
| Owner occupied | 421,900 | 86,136 |
| Percent of all occupied | 66.3 | 65.9 |
| Renter occupied | 214,824 | 44,606 |
| Lacking some or all plumbing facilities | 169,362 | 25,299 |
| Units with 1.01 or more persons per room | 96,344 | 18,842 |
| Value—owner occupied units: | | |
| Less than \$5,000 | 45,808 | 7,778 |
| \$5,000 to \$9,999 | 78,572 | 16,806 |
| \$10,000 to \$14,999 | 72,873 | 18,127 |
| \$15,000 to \$19,999 | 45,201 | 10,757 |
| \$20,000 to \$24,999 | 21,547 | 5,789 |
| \$25,000 to \$34,999 | 16,153 | 4,722 |
| \$35,000 to \$49,999 | 6,624 | 1,909 |
| \$50,000 or more | 3,311 | 1,031 |
| Median value | \$11,400 | \$12,400 |
| Contract rent—renter occupied units: | | |
| Less than \$60 per month | 92,379 | 21,742 |
| \$60 to \$99 | 32,190 | 9,160 |
| \$100 to \$149 | 12,748 | 3,260 |
| \$150 to \$199 | 3,398 | 1,451 |
| \$200 to \$299 | 558 | 290 |
| \$300 or more | 81 | 22 |
| Median rent | (9) | (9) |
| ELECTIONS | | |
| Vote cast for Representative, 1970 | 312,357 | 79,374 |
| Democratic | 269,193 | 50,527 |
| Republican | 28,847 | 28,847 |
| Percent for party with most votes | 86.2 | 63.7 |
| Vote cast for Representative, 1968 | 448,704 | 82,896 |
| Democratic | 415,021 | 82,896 |
| Republican | 33,683 | 0 |
| Vote cast for Representative, 1966 | 382,547 | 86,595 |
| Democratic | 282,574 | 71,377 |
| Republican | 61,514 | 0 |
| Vote cast for Representative, 1964 | 361,227 | 79,798 |
| Democratic | 325,950 | 79,798 |
| Republican | 35,277 | 0 |

| Item | State total | 3d |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|---------|
| Vote cast for President, 1968 | 654,509 | 140,979 |
| Democratic | 150,644 | 41,696 |
| Republican | 88,516 | 22,236 |
| American Independent | 415,349 | 77,047 |
| Percent for party with most votes | 63.5 | 54.7 |
| Vote for President, 1964 | 409,146 | 89,343 |
| Democratic | 52,618 | 9,605 |
| Republican | 356,528 | 79,738 |

1 Includes vacant units intended for year-round occupancy.
2 Less than \$60.
3 Data reflect party vote only; not comparable as vote cast for individual candidates. See text.

On November 19, 1971, I notified the residents of the Third District that I would not seek reelection in 1972. I arrived at the decision most reluctantly because I have always felt compelled by a sense of public duty.

In January of 1973, I shall return to Mississippi's Third Congressional District and expect to live there the remainder of my life.

We have an abundance of natural resources in our area. Our future is bright because the people of the Third District is its strongest resource. They live in mutual harmony and respect. They are hard-working, thrifty people—ever conscious of their precious heritage and ever desiring to make our world a better place to live.

While I admit prejudice, nonetheless I feel that the quality of life in Mississippi is unexcelled anywhere. We still enjoy a pollution-free environment, less crime than 48 other States in the Nation, and a rather leisurely pace of living.

In Mississippi, we also have social and economic problems which we are striving to solve. We will solve those problems so long as we maintain spiritual ideals and a determination to make progress together.

THE NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES ACT

(Mr. PREYER of North Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today, the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) is joining with me in introducing the National Educational Opportunities Act.

The principal draftsman of this bill is Alexander Bickel, chancellor, Kent Professor of Law and Legal History at Yale University. Dr. Bickel has studied deeply and written widely on school problems.

The present bill should not be confused with an earlier bill, H.R. 16484, introduced in the 91st Congress. I also collaborated with Dr. Bickel on this bill. If H.R. 16484 had been enacted it may have defused some of our present school troubles. But the approach of H.R. 16484 has now been ruled out by the Swann case.

The present bill sets out a national legislative policy to improve and equalize the results of primary and secondary education and to encourage the elimination of racial isolation—the fundamental issues in education.

The time is now for Congress to speak out on what our national educational policy should be.

We are late in doing so. Walter Lippman has pointed out that the Brown decision in 1954 was right. But we went wrong when the President and Congress then left the problem with the courts, whereas that was when the President and Congress should have brought in a national program headed by the President and ratified by Congress for integration according to a certain plan. The idea of throwing everybody together in integrated schools without any idea of how it would work out, and who should do it except the courts, was "a very crude and irresponsible proceeding."

Congress has missed earlier opportunities to express legislatively a national education policy. But we now have what may be the most timely opportunity—and perhaps our last opportunity—to speak out on this subject. The time is at hand when substantially all school systems will, in compliance with the Constitution, have become unitary. All sections of the country are now on substantially the same footing as far as integrated schooling goes, the South as well as the North and West, and will be treated alike. We are now all in the same boat. We have moved from the issue in de jure cases of obedience to the Constitution as defined by the Court, to the issue in de facto cases of what our national policy should be, and whether the courts or the legislature should make it.

The desegregation of our school system—the elimination of all legal barriers to integrated schools—did not result automatically in integrated schools. The question facing us is how much further we should push to bring about integration in schools. The Supreme Court will soon rule on its first de facto case. No one knows what kind of national school policy it will announce until it speaks. Congress has a responsibility to speak now to express its views on such a national education policy before it is too late—before that national school policy is set by the Court alone.

Also affecting the timeliness of congressional action are the discussions of new approaches to school financing and substandard schools, with the likelihood of greatly increased Federal funding and more equalized spending among school districts. A legislative framework, a coordinated policy, is needed for this effort.

This, then, is the time for Congress to take the lead in setting out a national education policy. But at present, Congress is in disarray. We are approaching the problem in bits and pieces—by constitutional amendments, or by "antibusing" add-ons to education legislation. The object of most of these piecemeal efforts is to delay, restrain, reverse, or modify court action, rather than offering an alternative to court action.

It is not enough for Congress to express its anger at the courts; we must offer a better policy. We cannot just say, "We will stop busing." We must say, "Here is a better answer than busing." Most parents are against busing. Black parents have as strong a sense of neighborhood schools as whites. But many

blacks feel that busing at the moment is the most effective way of providing minority groups with equal opportunities in education. The rationale for busing plans is, simply, that busing is alleged to be better than any alternative. We must offer the better alternative. One reason the courts have been so active in the educational field is that Congress has been so inactive. If we as a Congress and as a people do nothing, we virtually force the courts to order maximum racial balance—which means massive busing—as the final rule for the Nation.

The Supreme Court's present choice of an educational policy is maximum racial balance. In some areas—particularly in smaller towns with a relatively small minority population, and in rural areas—it may be the most effective way to provide minority and low income groups with equal opportunities in education. But certainly it should not be the only way permitted throughout the Nation, and usually it is not the most effective way. Racial balance per se does not necessarily improve anyone's education. The Coleman report is our only nationwide evidence on this point, and it carefully sets out the conditions necessary to make racial balance educationally effective. The hard fact is that the conditions of balance set out in the Coleman report are simply unobtainable in many areas of the country—specifically the large cities.

In other areas it is problematical if a proper racial balance can be achieved because of factors over which the courts have no control: As long as private schools are legal and residential mobility is permitted, the ideal racial balance keeps breaking down through resegregation. So that racial balance fails often to achieve its goals even after all the social costs are borne—the loss of the sense of community, the drain on political and administrative energies and funds. Rather than banging our heads against this rock of reality, and continually trying to attain the unattainable, should not we spend more resources and energy on alternative approaches? Neither Congress, the courts, nor anyone else know how to improve the education of black children and low income children. But we ought to try to find ways. The slender evidence of the Coleman report is not enough to justify our putting all our eggs in the one basket of racial balance, especially when we consider that: First, national racial balance is impossible, and second, there are other values conflicting with it. Many of our schools attended by low income and minority groups are inexclusably deprived—but the Coleman report is not enough evidence that racial balance is the only thing to do about it.

Rather than locking our school systems into a monolithic solution—racial balance—we should give society its head; we will work out some ways. We must allow the development of innovative and creative educational solutions to the problems of equal educational opportunities for minorities and low income groups. We must give black America a full range of choices, not cut off all op-

tions. For example, some blacks might prefer community controlled schools rather than being dispersed as a powerless percentage among all of the schools of a district. Why should not they have that choice?

The present bill provides no one final answer to our educational problems, but it provides for movement toward the answers.

The aim of this bill is to get a dialog going in this country as to the wisest choice of alternative means to reach the goal of a desegregated school system. It aims to reach the goal as far as possible through natural means and not contorted artificial means. It would be inductive and not coercive—though it would use both the stick and the carrot. It relies on the principle of voluntarism and citizen participation rather than having the Federal courts running our schools and imposing solutions. The hope inspiring it is that we can release the energies of local communities throughout this country to begin a series of innovative educational experiments directed at a common goal, so that when the Supreme Court addresses its fateful question of what a nationwide school policy should be it can say, in effect, "This is what we wanted you to do all along. We now declare victory. Go to it. You are on your own." This means that local communities must demonstrate good faith by a willingness to take meaningful steps. We must stop inviting by our own intransigence, such repugnant measures as busing. Only in this way can we put the divisive issue of race behind us once and for all, and redirect our energies to the real question—equal educational opportunities for all children.

The principal vehicle the bill uses to bring this about is a statewide federally sanctioned plan. Each State must within 2 years submit a plan aimed at carrying out the objectives of the act—basically, to improve and equalize educational results throughout the Nation; and to alleviate racial isolation. Federal financial assistance would vary not only in accordance with the population of a State, but in accordance with the number of minority families. Plans would be reviewable annually and would be geared to achieve their objectives in 10 years. Acceptable plans would include one or more of such features as magnet schools; educational parks; programs involving the joint participation of minority group and nonminority group children attending different schools, public or private, including extracurricular activities, and cooperative exchanges, etc.

Failure to produce a plan or to develop it annually in approved fashion would result in cutoff of title I and title III funds, and all other educational enrichment or desegregation assistance programs. It would not result in the cutoff of all Federal funds—such as school lunch programs, et cetera—but only of those funds specifically directed at educational enrichment or desegregation assistance.

Once plans have been approved, new Federal funds may be regularly appropriated for their implementation as they

mature. In addition, all sums appropriated under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and all other Federal funds appropriated for educational enrichment or for desegregation assistance will be allotted to implement the approved plan. Thus, the present array of Federal programs scattered throughout various titles, would be coordinated through a systematic statewide plan.

Each plan is to be developed in consultation with local educational agencies—and the local advisory committee including parents of students—and the State advisory council.

A National Advisory Council, appointed by the President, would advise with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to the development of criteria for the approval of plans, and review the operation of the plans.

The inducements for the States to submit an approved plan are: First, obtaining Federal funds, and second, ending court control of local schools.

The bill also includes:

First. A "majority transfer" provision which gives a student a right at the beginning of the school year to transfer from a school in which his race is in a majority to a school in which his race is in a minority, with transportation furnished. This is a first step and would result in siphoning off some students from inner city schools to the suburbs, thus relieving racial isolation. Experience indicates, however, that it would not result in any mass exodus.

Second. An "equalization of resources" provision which directs local educational agencies to eliminate disparities in educational practices between schools which result in unequal educational opportunities. Eight examples of such disparities are listed, such as comparative overcrowding of facilities, higher pupil-teacher ratios, provision of less student services, inadequate buildings, and so forth. This provision can be easily locked into any new tax law to provide a structure through which new financing plans for schools can be channeled to provide equal educational opportunities. Rather than the hit-or-miss system of each school district applying for grants, it would provide for a coordinated statewide program for the use of such funds.

In the long view of history it will be judged that our country has made a valiant and extraordinary effort in recent years to upgrade the education of the black man, to reduce racial isolation, and to integrate the black into our school system.

But the effort in its present form is failing. It is resulting, in our larger cities, in more segregated schools rather than less. It is causing a serious erosion of public support for our schools. Rather than moving us toward one society, it is condemning our children to insistent race consciousness and damaging our social fabric. Our school system is not working. It is increasingly alienated from parents who feel they are no longer in control of their children's education. The school situation is a major part of

the general alienation of people from their institutions which is moving to the point where it can conceivably endanger our Republic.

The effort will succeed in the long run. America will not desert the goal of bringing the black man into the mainstream of our society. But we must, and I am convinced we will, find some alternative ways of doing it that are less destructive to education and our social fabric than our present system of racial balance carried out by massive busing. This bill offers an alternative to that system. The bill follows:

H.R. 13552

A bill to provide for affording equal educational opportunities for students in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Educational Opportunities Act."

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that—

(a) The time is at hand when substantially all school systems administered or directed by local educational agencies will, in compliance with the Constitution, have become unitary.

(b) As the demography of the Nation continues to change, local educational agencies are not required by the Constitution to make year-by-year adjustments of the racial composition of student bodies, once the affirmative duty to desegregate has been fulfilled and racial discrimination through official action in public schools has been eliminated. In the absence of a showing that either a local educational agency or another agency of a State has deliberately attempted to fix or alter demographic patterns to affect the racial composition of the schools, further Federal intervention to secure performance of the affirmative Constitutional duty to desegregate is not called for.

(c) Throughout the Nation inequality in education opportunity persists for children from minority groups and from low-income families, and the educational results achieved with such children are often below the results achieved with children from other racial and socio-economic backgrounds.

(d) Throughout the Nation minority group children and children from low-income families are often concentrated in schools in which they form a majority of the student population.

PURPOSE

SEC. 3. It is the purpose of this Act:

(a) To improve and to equalize the results achieved by elementary and secondary education throughout the Nation.

(b) To encourage, where possible consistently with the objectives stated in subsection (a) of this section, the elimination of the concentration of children from minority groups and low-income families in certain schools.

(c) To prevent, when possible consistently with the objectives stated in subsection (a) of this section, the resegregation of schools after desegregation has been achieved.

(d) To eliminate any educational ill effects resulting from the concentration of children from minority groups and from low-income families in schools where such concentration persists.

TITLE I—LOCAL RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

RIGHT TO TRANSFER

SEC. 101. (a) (1) Subject to paragraph (2), any student in any public school shall have the right, at the beginning of any school

year, to transfer from a school to which he has been assigned or would in the regular course be assigned and in which his race is in a majority to a school in which his race is in a minority, if the school to which transfer is requested offers education in the grade equivalent to that from which the student transfers.

(2) A local educational agency may postpone a student's privilege to exercise the right granted by subsection (a) for a reasonable period of time while the most rapid feasible effective measures are taken to alleviate conditions of overcrowding in the school to which transfer is requested.

(b) Transportation which may be required to effectuate the right of transfer under this section shall be provided by the local educational agency.

(c) Any person or persons alleging that the right established in subsections (a) and (b) of this section has been denied to him or her individually or to a class of which he or she is a member, or the Attorney General, if he has reasonable cause to believe that any person or class of persons have been denied such right, may bring a civil action in the appropriate district court of the United States for equitable relief, including an application for a permanent or temporary injunction, or other order.

(d) In any action commenced under this section, the court may allow the moving party or parties, other than the United States, a reasonable attorney's fee as part of the costs, if such party or parties prevail in the action. Where the prevailing party is the defendant, the court may allow such prevailing party a reasonable attorney's fee as part of the cost upon a finding that the proceedings were unnecessary to bring about compliance.

EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

SEC. 102. (a) Where children from minority groups are concentrated in certain schools, local educational agencies shall insure that these students are not denied equal educational opportunities by practices which are less favorable for educational advancement than the practices at schools attended primarily by students of any other race, color, or national origin. Examples of disparities between such schools which may constitute a denial of equal educational opportunities include—

(1) comparative overcrowding of classes, facilities, and activities;

(2) assignment of fewer or less qualified teachers and other professional staff;

(3) provision of less adequate curriculums and extra-curricular activities or less adequate opportunities to take advantage of the available activities and services;

(4) provision of less adequate student services such as guidance and counseling, job placement, vocational training, medical services, remedial work;

(5) assigning heavier teaching and other professional assignments to school staff;

(6) maintenance of higher pupil-teacher ratios;

(7) provision of facilities (classrooms, libraries, laboratories, cafeterias, athletic, and extra-curricular facilities), instructional equipment and supplies, and textbooks in a comparatively insufficient quantity.

(8) provision of building, facilities, instructional equipment and supplies, and textbooks which, comparatively, are poorly maintained, outdated, temporary, or otherwise inadequate.

(b) No local educational agency shall adopt any policy or measure which is intended to achieve the separation of children on the basis of race, and has that effect.

(c) The Secretary shall issue regulations further setting forth measures to be taken by local educational agencies to come into compliance with this section.

LAWSUITS

SEC. 103. (a) Any person or persons alleging, or the Attorney General if he has reasonable cause to believe, that any policy or measure of a local educational agency violates section 102 of this Act, may bring a civil action in the appropriate United States district court for equitable relief, including an application for a permanent or temporary injunction, or other order. If the court finds that such policy or measure exists, it shall order the rescinding of such policy or measure, and shall order affirmative action to be taken to cure present effects caused by such policy or measure.

(b) In any action commenced under this section, the court may allow the moving party, other than the United States, a reasonable attorney's fee as part of the costs, if such party or parties prevail in the action. Where the prevailing party is the defendant, the court may allow such prevailing party a reasonable attorney's fee as part of the cost upon a finding that the proceedings were unnecessary to bring about compliance.

(c) Any policy or measure which violates section 102 shall also be deemed to constitute a violation of section 601 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, whether or not a civil action with respect to such violation has been brought under this section.

TITLE II—STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

STATE PLAN

SEC. 201. (a) Each State shall prepare and submit to the Secretary for his approval, in accordance with regulations issued by him a plan to carry out the purpose of this Act as stated in section 3.

(b) The plans of Virginia and Maryland shall take account of the areas of the District of Columbia nearest to each and shall be worked out in consultation with the local educational agency of the District of Columbia.

ADVISORY COUNCILS AND COMMITTEES

SEC. 202. The plan submitted by each State shall provide for—

(a) the establishment of a State Advisory council which shall be appointed by the Governor and which shall—

(1) include as members businessmen, educators, parents, and representatives of the general public, and shall be so constituted that parents of children attending public schools constitute at least a majority of such membership, and that parents of children from minority groups are represented in an approximately proportionate number to the number of minority group children in the school age population of the State;

(2) advise the State educational agency on the development of and policy matters arising in the administration of the State plan submitted pursuant to this title; and

(3) prepare and submit through the State educational agency to the Secretary an annual evaluation report accompanied by such additional comments of the State agency as is deemed appropriate, which evaluates the progress made in that year by the State in achieving the purpose of this Act; and

(b) the establishment of local advisory committees which shall—

(1) include as members parents of children attending public schools, and shall be so constituted that parents of children from minority groups are represented in an approximately proportionate number to the number of minority group children in the school age population of the local educational agency; and

(2) advise the local educational agency on its participation in the State plan.

PROVISIONS OF THE PLAN

SEC. 203. The plan submitted by each State shall—

(a) be submitted to the Secretary by June 30, 1973;

(b) be developed in consultation with local educational agencies and the State advisory council;

(a)(1) define goals consistent with the purpose of this Act as set forth in Section 3 and provide for attaining such goals by a date approved by the Secretary, but in no event later than August 30, 1983;

(2) include specific means for attaining such goals, which means may include such features as:

(A) drawing children from the core city into outlying suburban schools;

(B) redrawing zone boundaries, pairing and clustering schools, establishing educational parks and magnet schools;

(C) providing professional and paraprofessional staff for guidance, counseling and special services to minority group children in new environments to which they may be assigned or may have transferred;

(D) expanding or altering facilities to accommodate students transferred to new schools;

(E) public education efforts and other community activities in support of new plans, programs, or projects;

(F) work study programs for junior high school and high school children in need of financial assistance to complete their education;

(G) developing and implementing interracial education programs and projects involving the joint participation of minority group and non-minority group children attending different schools, public or private, including extracurricular activities and cooperative exchanges or other arrangements between schools within the same or different school districts;

(H) remedial and other services to meet the special needs of underachieving children, including development and employment of new instructional techniques and materials.

(I) decentralization and diversification of clusters of public schools under community control, but only upon decision by majority vote in the community, and only if the principle of voluntarism is observed so that communities are self-defining, and families that do not wish to form part of a community control system are supported in transferring their children out;

(J) tuition voucher projects for use in public and private non-profit schools.

(d) assure that in each year of operation of the plan substantial progress will be made toward meeting the purpose of the Act;

(e) specify how additional State financial assistance will be made available to local educational agencies undergoing desegregation pursuant to a court order, a plan approved in accordance with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or an order issued by a State agency or official of competent jurisdiction;

(f) specify how programs now funded under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, or any other Federally funded program for educational enrichment or desegregation assistance, are fitted into and coordinated with operation of the plan.

(g) specify the procedures to be used by the State educational agency in coordinating the efforts of the local educational agencies desegregating (as specified in subsection (e) or voluntarily integrating).

(h) specify what procedures will be used by the State educational agency to assume control (after proper notice and an administrative hearing) of local educational agencies where the State agency finds a clear and systematic pattern of the downgrading of public education by the local educational agency.

(i) specify what procedures will be used by the State educational agency for involving on an equitable basis children enrolled in private nonprofit schools in the programs funded under this Act to the extent that

their participation will assist in achieving the purpose of the Act; and

(j) assure that the State educational agency will require each local educational agency to report to it annually on its implementation of the State plan, and that the State agency will report annually to the Secretary on the State's overall implementation of its plan.

GRANTS

SEC. 204. (a) (1) There are authorized to be appropriated for carrying out this title not in excess of \$100,000,000 for fiscal year 1973, and not in excess of \$500,000,000 for fiscal year 1974, and each fiscal year thereafter.

(2) The Secretary shall allot 80 per centum of the sums appropriated under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year among the States so that the amount allotted to each State bears the same ratio to such 80 per centum of such sums as the aggregate number of minority group children aged 5-17, inclusive, in such State bears to the aggregate number of such children in all the States.

(b) From the sum allotted to each State for fiscal year 1973, the Secretary may make a planning grant to the State educational agency and supplementary planning grants to other public and private agencies assisting the State agency, to enable such State to prepare, and prepare for carrying out, its State plan.

(c) From the sum allotted to each State for fiscal year 1974, and each succeeding fiscal year, the Secretary may make grants to the State educational agency for programs to implement the approved State plan.

(d) All sums appropriated under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and all other Federal funds appropriated under programs for educational enrichment or for desegregation assistance shall be allotted to implement the approved plan.

(e) From the 20 per centum of the appropriations under subsection (a) (1) not allotted among the States pursuant to subsection (a) (2) for a fiscal year, the Secretary may make grants to, or contracts with, any public or private agencies which may assist in achieving the purpose of this Act.

(f) No funds granted under this title may be used to supplant State or local educational funds being expended, or that would have been expended, absent the grant, in or for public schools or to assist any private school directly.

ADMINISTRATION OF GRANTS

SEC. 205. (a) The Secretary shall approve any State plan which meets the requirements of section 203, and shall not finally disapprove any such plan without first affording the agency administering the plan reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing—

(1) Disapproves a plan pursuant to subsection (a) or,

(2) Finds:

(i) that no plan has been submitted by a State

(ii) that a State plan approved under subsection (a) has been so changed that it no longer complies with the requirements of section 203.

(iii) that in the administration of such a plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provisions, or

(iv) that a grantee is in violation of section 204(f), the Secretary shall notify the grantee that further payments will not be made to the grantee under this title, under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, or under title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 or any other educational enrichment or desegregation assistance program (or, in his discretion, that further payments will be limited to grantees or programs not affected

by the failure) until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, the Secretary shall make no further payments under such titles (or shall limit payments to grantees or programs not affected by the failure).

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 206. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Secretary's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan under section 205(a) or with his final action under section 205(b), such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary. The Secretary thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

(b) The findings of fact by the Secretary, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Secretary to take further evidence, and the Secretary may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 301. For purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "minority group" means Negroes, American Indians, Spanish-surnamed Americans, and Orientals.

(b) The term "low-income family" means a family with an annual income of less than \$3,000.

(c) The term "local educational agency" means a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control, or direction, of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or such combination of school districts or counties as are recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary or secondary schools, or a combination of local educational agencies.

(d) The term "nonprofit" as applied to an agency, organization, or institution means an agency, organization, or institution owned or operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations contributions to which are deductible under section 170(b) (1) (A) (ii) of the Internal Revenue Code and no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

(e) The term "school" means a school which provides elementary or secondary education, as determined under State law, except that it does not include any education provided beyond grade 12.

(f) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(g) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the States supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law for this purpose.

(h) The term "State" means one of the fifty states or the District of Columbia.

EVALUATION

SEC. 302. Such portion as the Secretary may determine, but not more than 1 per centum, of any appropriation under this Act for any fiscal year shall be available to him under section 204(e) for evaluation (directly or by grant or contract) of the programs, activities, and projects authorized by this Act.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 303. (a) There is hereby established a National Advisory Council on Educational Opportunities, consisting of fifteen members appointed by the President, which shall—

(1) advise the Secretary with respect to the operation of the plans authorized and required by this title, including the preparation of regulations and the development of criteria for the approval of applications; and

(2) review the operation of the plans.

(b) The Secretary shall submit an estimate under the authority of section 401(c) and part C of the General Education Provisions Act to the Congress for the appropriations necessary for the Council created by subsection (a) to carry out its functions.

SENATOR HUMPHREY'S 1968 STAND ON THE VIETNAM WAR

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the passage of time tends to obscure facts which existed even in the recent past. Unfortunately, those who compose political rhetoric take advantage of our short memories. Recently, an article in the February 3, 1972, New York Times was brought to my attention. The article, "Mr. Humphrey and the Bombing" by Chester L. Cooper, very clearly explains Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY'S 1968 stand on a bombing halt, a cease-fire, and withdrawal. I commend the article to my colleagues, and ask permission to insert it in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 3, 1972]

MR. HUMPHREY AND THE BOMBING

(By Chester L. Cooper)

WASHINGTON.—Hubert Humphrey's recent reference to his stance on Vietnam during the 1968 Presidential campaign ("I pledged an end to the bombing, a cease-fire and an immediate troop withdrawal") has, not surprisingly, brought forth some pointed reminders of his much more ambivalent position at the time. Tom Wicker rightly recalls that Humphrey's actual statement on the Vietnam issue made in late September 1968 was weak in its substance and tardy in its timing. Mr. Wicker takes on the painful task of going back into recent history as part of the press' duty to "keep the record straight." But there is more to the record and this is as good a time as any to reveal it.

In June 1968 Mr. Humphrey had a speech in hand which advocated an immediate, total bombing halt and, as I remember, a cease-fire. He was anxious to deliver this in advance of the Democratic platform-drafting committee's meeting scheduled for late July. Such a speech would, of course, mark a break with the President on Vietnam and would fly in the face of Johnson's insistence that the drafting committee ride along with the Administration's current partial bombing policy.

Humphrey, I was told, was ready to stand up to L.B.J. on this issue as a personal declaration of independence providing he could

be assured that his advocacy of a bombing halt would not rock the boat in Paris where Averell Harriman and Cyrus Vance were then meeting with Hanoi's representatives.

Despite the rhetoric, then and since, about the Vice President being kept "closely informed" of what was transpiring in Paris, he was actually told very little about the course of the talks. He decided to keep the halt-the-bombing speech on ice until he could get a better sense of the effect it would have on the American negotiating position.

Prior to my departure for Paris in early July (I was then a consultant to Governor Harriman on the negotiations), Robert Nathan, Humphrey's chief adviser on domestic and foreign issues, went over the Vice President's speech and outlined his concern. At Nathan's request, I agreed to press Harriman and Vance as to whether Humphrey's advocacy of a bombing halt would jeopardize their efforts. But that was only part of the problem, both Nathan and I agreed. Since Johnson, in his mood at the time, would be quite likely to claim that Humphrey had thrown away a trump negotiations card, the American delegation would surely be queried on this point by the press. Even if the two American negotiators felt that Humphrey's speech would not hurt the American position in Paris would, indeed could, Harriman and Vance publicly say so?

Soon after I arrived in Paris I put the question to Harriman and Vance, close friends and political backers of Humphrey. Although they were in favor of an immediate bombing halt and cease-fire and were becoming increasingly impatient with Washington's rigid stance, they were reluctant to embarrass the President by what, in effect, would be a public endorsement of Humphrey's position. But the real snag was their feeling that there was still some hope that L.B.J. might accept a proposition then being prepared for Washington which involved an early, complete bombing halt. Humphrey's speech might serve only to stiffen Johnson's adamant stand. And so neither Harriman nor Vance felt he could take Humphrey off the hook. It wasn't an easy decision.

I returned to Washington a few days later and met with Larry O'Brien who was managing Humphrey's campaign (Nathan was out of town). The platform committee was already forming up for a battle royal over the bombing question. Humphrey's speech would clear the air, would put the Vice President on the side of those whom he respected and whose support he wanted, and would demonstrate that Humphrey intended to be his own master. It was a long, agitated session, but the basic issue was decided in the first few minutes: If, in Harriman's and Vance's judgment, Humphrey's call for a bombing halt would hurt the American negotiating position, the speech should and would be shelved.

America has been blessed with few statesmen during the last several decades, but on occasion a politician makes a genuinely statesmanlike move. This is rare enough, God knows, especially when it is done gracefully and quietly. In hindsight, Humphrey's speech would probably not have made any difference in Paris (L.B.J. turned the Harriman-Vance recommendation of mid-July down cold) and his waffling on the bombing issue hurt his chances, possibly critically. But in July 1968 H.H.H. did what he thought was right.

AMERICAN LEGION DAY

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity today to pay tribute to the American Legion, which has been meeting in Washington these

past few days, for its very many contributions to our country and our way of life.

Since its founding in 1919, the American Legion has grown to almost one-half million members in 16,000 posts, composed of men and women who, having served their country in uniform, now wish to continue to contribute to their Nation's well-being as civilians, as well as look out for the welfare of the veteran.

As a member of Post 21 in Schenectady, N.Y., for over 25 years, I am well aware of the fine work done by legion posts across the country as the largest spokesman for the American veteran. All Americans are indebted to the legion for its successes in aiding returning American veterans and in helping widows and children of servicemen to obtain the benefits they deserve. Some 70,000 Vietnam veterans have already been placed by the Legion's Jobs for Veterans program. I might also point out that thousands of communities have benefited from the sponsorship by various posts of forward-looking youth groups and civic programs.

Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans I am sure would want to join with me in expressing our gratitude to the patriotic men and women of the American Legion for the contributions they have made to our Nation, in congratulating the legion on its 53d anniversary and in wishing the best of success to all these fine legion posts around the country in all their endeavors.

EMERGENCY MASS TRANSPORTATION PASSENGER ACT OF 1972 COSPONSORED BY 61

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing, with 61 cosponsors, the Emergency Mass Transportation Passenger Act of 1972, H.R. 13362, to provide Federal operating subsidies for public and private mass transit systems. I am pleased and grateful that so many of our colleagues have joined in cosponsoring this legislation that would provide our transit systems so desperately in need of help with \$400 million annually for the next 5 years. There is little dispute that today mass transportation faces severe problems affecting both transit operators and transit riders. Operating costs are outstripping revenues collected from the fare box, too often resulting in reductions in service and fare increases. Today many States and localities are having to help finance the operation of public transportation. The time has come for the Federal Government to do its share. Federal assistance would go a long way in placing transit systems on a sound financial basis and in breaking the cycle of deteriorating service and loss in ridership now plaguing mass transit.

The unique quality of the Emergency Mass Transportation Passenger Act of 1972 is that it cuts through the red tape of ordinary grant programs by providing a formula for the automatic allocation

of funds to transit systems on the basis of passengers serviced. This means that every bus, subway, and commuter railroad system in the country would receive funds in proportion to its share of the country's total mass transit ridership. To receive its share, a State agency or local public body would only have to file a request for payment and provide assurances that the Federal funds it received under this program would be used to assist in defraying operating costs of the transit systems in its jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, it is noteworthy that today the Senate passed S. 3248, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1972, that included a provision for Federal mass transit operating subsidies to be funded annually at \$400 million for the next 2 years. The distinguished Senators from New York (Mr. JAVITS) and New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) are to be commended for their leadership in securing the Senate's approval of this assistance for mass transit.

It is my hope that the House can pass a comparable measure soon, providing for an immediate allocation of funds—to meet today's transit crisis—on a per passenger basis.

Mr. Speaker, the following are the Members of the House who have joined in sponsoring the Emergency Mass Transportation Passenger Act of 1972:

LIST OF SPONSORS

Bella S. Abzug, Brock Adams, Joseph Adabbo, Herman Badillo, Edward P. Boland, Frank Brasco, James Burke, Phillip Burton, Hugh Carey, Shirley Chisholm, Frank M. Clark, William Clay, Jorge L. Córdova, John H. Dent, John D. Dingell, Harold D. Donohue, Don Edwards, Joshua Ellberg, Dante Fascell.

Hamilton Fish, Jr., Edwin B. Forsythe, Donald M. Fraser, Cornelius E. Gallagher, Joseph M. Gaydos, Seymour Halpern, Michael J. Harrington, Augustus F. Hawkins, Henry Helstoski, Louise Day Hicks, Robert L. Leggett, Joseph M. McDade, Stewart B. McKinney, Ray J. Madden, Abner Mikva, George Miller, Bradford Morse, Robert N. C. Nix, Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Claude Pepper.

Melvin Price, Charles Rangel, Thomas Rees, Peter Rodino, Fred B. Rooney, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, William F. Ryan, Paul S. Sarbanes, James H. Scheuer, John F. Seiberling, Louis Stokes, Samuel S. Stratton, Leonor Sullivan, James Symington, Frank Thompson, Jr., Robert Tlerran, Lionel Van Deerlin, Jerome R. Waldie, Lawrence Williams, Charles Wilson, Lester Wolff, Gus Yatron.

GUARANTEED JOBS AND FULL EMPLOYMENT—A NATIONAL POLICY

(Mr. BADILLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, the right to a job is a basic human right and it is incumbent upon the Federal Government to provide every man and woman who wants work with a job.

This great country must adopt as a national policy—as a national commitment—the goal of full employment. We must dedicate ourselves to assuring employment for all those who are willing and able to work. It is imperative that we adopt those policies and programs necessary to achieve this objective.

Last year the unemployment rate was at or above 6 percent for 8 of the 12 months and, in the other 4 months, it never fell lower than 2 percentage points. These figures do not tell the full story, however. They do not indicate those who are only working part-time or who are underemployed even though on the job 8 hours. These statistics fail to include those who have despaired of finding employment and who have forsaken the search for a job. I am certain that if these countless unfortunate persons were included in the unemployment statistics—as they should be—we would have a jobless rate which would boggle the imagination and which would create a national scandal.

When the Congress passed the Employment Act of 1946 more than a quarter of a century ago, we supposedly established a national goal of assuring an opportunity for a gainful and productive job to every American who seeks work. As yet, the elusive goal of full employment has not been reached. We have not even come close to it. The lowest unemployment rate in the last decade, for example, was during the fourth quarter of 1968 at which time the overall unemployment rate was at 3.4 percent.

Further investigation reveals that the rate for white adult males in that period was only 1.8 percent. However, it is important to note that the rate for women was 4.5 percent; for blacks, 6.6 percent; for white youth, 10.8 percent; and for black youths, 25.3 percent. This last figure indicates that one out of every four black youths was unemployed and this is certainly nothing of which we can be proud, even though the overall low unemployment rate was hailed, at the time, as a significant accomplishment.

It is an especially sad commentary that, among the 5.4 million persons currently seeking work but unable to find jobs, there are hundreds of thousands of highly educated and experienced men and women. These people, most of whom are in their late 30's, 40's, and early 50's, are well-trained scientists and engineers with advanced degrees and years of practical applications of their skills. However, because of our grossly misdirected and ill-conceived priorities, they are now unemployed and are not able to find meaningful employment. Their current predicament is the result of policies which have permitted an estimated 63 percent of our Nation's technical and scientific talent to be devoted to developing more efficient means of death and destruction rather than to maintaining and improving commercial productivity and working to solve the many and varied domestic problems in health, housing, environmental protection and other pressing areas.

The plight of these people is particularly tragic in that the bottom has fallen out just at the point where they had become established. Now their homes have had to be mortgaged and, in some cases, they have been lost. Their children's educational plans have had to be severely restricted or scrapped. They have been forced to swallow their pride and accept welfare. In some areas of the Northwest they have even received for-

eign aid from Japan in the form of food. Stop-gap relief measures have been implemented but are quickly running dry and no permanent solution is in sight. Whereas they were making anywhere from \$16,000 to \$35,000 a year ago, many have been unemployed for close to a year and are no longer contributing to the economy through taxes and overall buying power.

Early last summer the Congress passed the Emergency Employment Act of 1971. This \$2.25 billion piece of legislation is aimed at providing public service employment for some 130,000 persons. However, this well-intentioned but severely limited measures hardly scratches the surface and much more must be done. Nevertheless, if you consider the speed with which these jobs were filled and the short time in which funds were utilized, the Emergency Employment Act program clearly demonstrates the efficacy and importance of public service employment and shows that these jobs can be filled. This program was originally intended to be limited in scope and its authors considered it to be a stop-gap measure. Because of the success in filling these various public service positions, however, I view this program as an important pilot project. This experience certainly obviates the need for any additional studies into the subject.

Full employment is an economic and social imperative. In our society people need work. Persons who are employed are able to maintain their pride and self-respect by supporting their dependents and themselves. Wage earners have a spirit of independence which is impossible to achieve when one is receiving welfare. Working people are contributing to the economy and are not looked upon as economic parasites.

When I speak of full employment, I do not mean, as many economists and others do, that unemployment is at a level of 4.0, 3.5, 2.5, 2.0 percent or whatever. I mean that every able-bodied person who wants a job is employed, earning a living and paying his own way. There is no acceptable rate of unemployment as far as I am concerned and the only possible definition of full employment must be zero percent unemployed.

The ill-conceived and misguided policies of the past are no longer acceptable and are clearly outmoded. New initiatives and more dynamic action must be taken if we are going to effectively grapple with the unemployment crisis.

The only logical answer to assist those who remain unemployed or seriously underemployed is a federally financed full employment program—a program of guaranteed jobs. I believe experience has demonstrated that the private sector is unable to expand to provide jobs for those millions of able-bodied unemployed, particularly without creating an inflationary situation at the same time. The solution rests in the creation of new public sector jobs financed by the Federal Government and provided at the local, State, and Federal levels. Such a program would go far beyond the current Emergency Employment Act program.

It is equally clear that the Congress must take the initiative as the present

administration has utterly failed to properly respond to the unemployment crisis. Instead of taking prompt and effective action to propose meaningful solutions to the problem, this administration chooses to study the issue—even though we have been experiencing spiraling unemployment conditions for well over a year. Earlier this month, we were informed that an urgent study, directed by Treasury Secretary Connally, has been launched to uncover the reasons for persistently high unemployment and to recommend ways of attacking the problem. This seems to be standard operating procedure—when you really do not want to cope with a problem—study it. However, we simply cannot afford the time or luxury of any studies or bureaucratic inquiries into this critical situation. As I mentioned, we already have had experience with a pilot project in the form of the Emergency Employment Act. Also, this administration has made its attitude rather clear by vetoing the accelerated public works bill in the last Congress—a measure aimed at beginning to tackle the unemployment problem—and only begrudgingly accepting the Emergency Employment Act last year. The outmoded Nixon approaches to this problem are clearly inappropriate and ineffective and the Congress must obviously take the leadership in resolving the unemployment crisis.

Accordingly, I intend to introduce legislation establishing a program to assist States and local communities in providing needed public services and providing for employment to all unemployed and underemployed persons. Under this measure, any person who is unable to find work in the private sector will be guaranteed a job in a municipal, county, State or Federal agency. Such jobs will be neither transitional nor make work. Rather, the employment will be such that the social concerns of Government will be translated into concrete action. At the same time they will be jobs in which the workers will be able to take pride in their accomplishments and in their ability to be self-sufficient. My legislation is consistent with and fulfills the recommendations of the National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress which, 6 years ago, urged that the Federal Government commit itself as the employer of last resort by guaranteeing useful employment opportunities to those not absorbed by more orthodox private and public employment.

The Guaranteed Employment Act of 1972 provides that the Federal Government will encourage and assist States and local communities to develop and implement comprehensive programs for the employment of persons in such badly needed public service areas as hospitals, schools, parks, recreation centers, public health, sanitation and countless other municipal and State services. It further provides, however, that if such plans are not formulated by the States and cities, the Secretary of Labor will then take the necessary steps to create necessary and appropriate employment programs.

My bill will also provide for job training and guidance where necessary. An integral part will be the establishment of a national employment bank which will not only provide for job training for the unskilled and semiskilled but will also assist these persons to locate suitable and meaningful employment wherever it might exist throughout the country. This job bank would locate potential employment in areas which may not have sufficient or qualified manpower and would help a prospective worker and his family to relocate, including assistance in locating housing and providing financial assistance to become resettled.

The job training will not be limited to only the traditional manpower instruction but, where needed and requested, will furnish basic educational skills in English, arithmetic and so on. It will aim at enhancing the educational level of the student/worker as well as providing him with basic occupational proficiencies. By providing this often-needed training and guidance, the full employment program enables the workers to move into regular employment on a par with his coworkers.

I frankly anticipate that a hue and cry will be raised by some of my colleagues in my submitting this measure guaranteeing a job to anyone who wants one. However, for the 14 months I have been in Congress I have heard all too frequently that the people on welfare should work and get off the public dole. Well, I am now giving my colleagues the opportunity to put into effect what they have been talking about for these past many months and years. By providing meaningful employment to those now receiving unemployment insurance and public assistance, we will be sharply re-ordering our priorities and will be permitting the able-bodied unemployed to contribute to the economy. By shifting Federal financial resources from the endless drain of welfare payments and unemployment compensation to socially useful and economically productive endeavors, we will be helping to stabilize and invigorate the economy.

If we are to fulfill commitments made to protect and develop our physical environment and to carry forward essential social service programs, the personnel must be supported by Federal assistance. In 1965, for example, the Office of Economic Opportunity reported that 4.3 million new jobs could be filled in public service if the Government were to fulfill its obligations in just the two aforementioned areas. These are not make work or "leaf-raking" jobs but urgently needed programs aimed at assisting States and local communities to meet the need for basic and improved public services. Persons otherwise straining the welfare and unemployment rolls can serve in such areas as sanitation, educational and nurses aides, practical nurses, parks and recreation employees, just to name a few of the countless positions. I also anticipate the development of paraprofessionals in many occupational areas. These persons free professional workers to work at the top of their skills and, at the same time, perform useful work, par-

ticularly in improving the delivery of human services.

We have already had some experience with public service employment programs funded by Federal, State and city governments. Generally, I believe these various programs have been successful and demonstrate the efficacy of expanding such efforts into a more comprehensive undertaking. These programs show that it is far more desirable to have purer air and water, more livable cities, improved social services rather than a vast pool of unproductive, unused manpower. The Federal Government must take the initiative as, regardless of how well intentioned, private employers are making little more than a dent in the ranks of the hard-core unemployed. As the AFL-CIO observed a few years ago,

Massive job creation must derive mainly from the public sector.

The millions who are today unemployed and underemployed are the tragic byproducts of our economic problems and distorted national priorities. We can no longer ignore their plight and we must take affirmative action. It should be perfectly clear that private enterprise is not going to solve these problems and we simply cannot afford to wait for the private sector to act. If we are going to properly address ourselves to the problems of the poor and unemployed, the Federal Government must take the initiative.

I believe the full employment program—a program of guaranteed jobs for every able-bodied man and woman—is a solution to this national tragedy and that it will not only bring a halt to the spiraling unemployment rate, but will also contribute needed services to our cities and States. Further, if the poor are able to secure gainful employment, they will then be able to acquire their own housing, provide education for their children and take care of their own health needs. Thus, by providing guaranteed jobs and an income to the poor, we will, in turn, be resolving these and other pressing domestic problems.

The measure I am introducing will give new hope to millions of Americans and will assure full and equal participation in the economic and social life of this country by all citizens. It will not only resolve one of our most pressing crises—unemployment—but will also lead to early solutions to other ills affecting our Nation.

THE EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES ACT

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to estimate exactly how many deaths and injuries occur because of a lack of adequate ambulance facilities.

The chairman of the American Heart Association's Committee on Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation, Dr. Archer Gordon, has estimated that, if the public were educated to be able to recognize the symptoms of heart attack and, if ambu-

lance attendants could administer prophylactic treatment, at least 30 percent of cardiac deaths could be prevented. The Ambulance Association of America has estimated that 25,000 persons are permanently injured or disabled every year by untrained ambulance attendants and rescue workers.

But whatever the precise figures are, certainly the need for new approaches in this field is very great.

The National Highway Safety Bureau, in promulgating its Standard II dealing with Emergency Medical Services, has observed:

Few areas of the U.S. now have adequate emergency services. In most areas, there has been inadequate planning of emergency logistics, communications, and transportation facilities, and present services are inadequately managed.

The Bureau goes on to point out that ambulance drivers and attendants are not generally required to be expert in first aid, and in most parts of the country they are not required to carry adequate equipment.

Such an inadequate state of emergency health care delivery is truly unacceptable, particularly in light of the fact that accidents are the fourth leading cause of death for all Americans, and the first for those aged 1 to 37. According to Dr. Oscar P. Hampton Jr., assistant director for trauma activities of the American College of Surgeons, in 1968 trauma resulted in more than 100,000 deaths, 10 million cases of temporary disability, and 400,000 cases of permanent disability at a cost of \$18 billion. Trauma patients in that year used 22 million hospital days—more than four times as many as all cancer patients.

Better emergency medical service does not require new scientific breakthroughs; it simply requires the application of well-known techniques. With respect to the treatment of trauma, Dr. William Pitts, Jr., professor of surgery at the University of Pennsylvania, has said:

The gap between what could be done and what is being done is wider than for any other disease.

It is absolutely essential that the Congress move to meet this crisis in emergency medical transportation. Therefore, I have cosponsored the Emergency Medical Services Act, H.R. 12787—13447 with cosponsors—which was introduced by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON).

This bill would establish a means to set standards and regulations on ambulance services, as well as provide financial assistance to qualified communities for the operation of ambulance corps. It authorizes \$375 million during the fiscal years 1973 through 1976 for matching grants to ambulance services operated by or under the control of local governments.

This legislation would improve ambulance service throughout the country, and make it possible for emergency treatment to be provided more effectively, thus saving untold numbers of lives.

NDEA LOAN DEFERRALS FOR CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I was recently made aware of a serious inequity in the national defense loan program that prevents the suspension of a student's repayment obligations while he is participating in an alternate service under the terms of the Military Selective Service Act. I have introduced legislation, H.R. 13344, to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958, that would correct this situation.

Each year the National Defense Loan program allows some 500,000 young people to obtain the necessary financial aid for the completion of their college education. Under this program a student may borrow up to \$1,000 each year to a total of \$5,000 for undergraduate study and up to \$2,500 each year for graduate or professional study, to a combined total of \$10,000 for both undergraduate and graduate work. The program allows the recipient to repay the loan at 3-percent interest, extending over a 10-year period. The program also allows a repayment deferral for those individuals who have chosen to serve this country through their participation in the Armed Forces, the Peace Corps, and the Vista programs. Participants in these programs are granted as much as 3 years before they must begin repayment of the loan or have any interest charged.

My bill, H.R. 13344, would provide the same 3-year deferral for those individuals who are found, under the provision of the Selective Service Act, by their respective draft boards to be conscientiously opposed to war and are participating in an approved alternate service. It is often the case that these particular individuals receive as little money for as much hard work as those who participate in the Armed Forces, Peace Corps, and Vista and are unable to begin the repayment of their loan at the required time. This amendment will merely correct the oversight that has denied conscientious objectors the same privilege of loan deferral that has previously been afforded other individuals who participate in Federal programs of national service.

Congress should be proud of the educational opportunities and benefits the National Defense Loan program has provided, and I feel that Congress should correct this inequity so that alternate service for conscientious objectors will be treated equally with the other national service programs under the National Defense Education Act.

"CANAL ZONE SOVEREIGNTY": COMMENTARY BY GEORGE PUTNAM

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on September 22 and 23, 1971, the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs held public hearings on pending Panama Canal sovereignty resolutions when seven Members of Congress testified and 29 submitted statements. These hearings, printed for use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and widely distributed over the Nation, supply authentic information on Panama Canal history and problems. But the committee has not yet made its report.

In reading these hearings special attention is invited to the testimony of Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD of Pennsylvania, one of the most distinguished authorities on interoceanic canal history and problems ever to serve in the Congress, and particularly to his commentary refuting the statement of a Member of the other body from California.

Two important papers quoted by Representative FLOOD are a memorial to the Congress on "Panama Canal sovereignty and modernization" and the notable 1971 Panama Canal Resolution adopted by the 53d National Convention of the American Legion, which merit careful reading by all who wish to understand the canal problem in its stark realities.

The efforts in the Congress to alert the people in our Nation about the Panama Canal has made a rapidly widening impact, as evidenced by the number of informed broadcasts by news commentators, among them George Putnam. In his last commentary on Canal Zone sovereignty, he shows the relation between what is occurring as regards the Panama Canal and Soviet policy. He describes the real issue, as U.S. control versus Communist control of the canal.

To give his statement wider circulation, I quote it as part of my remarks:

CANAL ZONE SOVEREIGNTY

(By George Putnam)

It is this reporter's opinion that within the next thirty to ninety days, a desperate attempt is going to be made to transfer sovereignty over the Panama Canal Zone to Panama and to deliver control and the defense of the Canal to Panama.

Now this means that any arrangements for us to share in the control of the defense of the Canal would be subject to unilateral cancellation by Panama. It would mean that Panama could denounce any treaty and then negotiate with the Soviet Union or Red China to assist in operation and defense of the Panama Canal.

It also means the United States would be forced to make a choice—between war or withdrawal. And if it resorted to force to preserve the vital waterway, we would then be acting in violation of international law, because we had already surrendered sovereignty.

First, it was abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine on the part of our government—and this led to a takeover of Cuba and Chile by the Communists. The next step appears to be abandonment of the Panama Canal. And these are shocking—*shocking* examples of a backstepping United States wherever world opinion seems to challenge our very presence.

Fifty-seven years ago, United States engineers completed construction of the Canal,

and the first ocean steamer passed through the fifty mile ditch August third of 1914.

Building of the Canal, converting one of the worst pest holes on earth into a modern engineering feat, cost the United States 375 million dollars.

The United States, in addition to that figure, paid twenty-five million dollars to Colombia to compensate her for her loss of Panama. And a concession was made to Panama in 1936 when we increased the annual payments from 250 thousand to 430 thousand dollars. And then, in 1955, we signed a new treaty with Panama, in which the amount paid to Panama annually rose to almost two million dollars. But that isn't all. We also gave Panama twenty-four million dollars worth of real estate and buildings, together with a twenty million dollar ferry bridge.

But apparently none of this is enough. And each year since 1964, Panama has demanded the entire Canal Zone, including the Panama Canal. Each year Panama has demanded that we get out, that we give her the Canal Zone, or internationalize it and give special rights to Panama. The United States has lived up to its part of the bargain, but apparently this is not enough.

Now it is this reporter's opinion that behind the scenes, lurks the grasping claw of the Kremlin, represented by Fidel Castro. Over the years, Castro Communists have been deeply involved in riots in Panama. The Communists have fanned the flames of anti-U.S. sentiment all the way from Havana to Moscow and Peking, urging Panama on to greater demands.

Quite bluntly, to relinquish U.S. sovereignty of the Panama Canal would rupture the jugular of our hemispheric defense. It would speed Soviet Russia toward its goal of controlling the vital waterways of the world. And the nation that controls the waterways of the world, also controls the world.

Eighty percent of Peru's and Chile's imports and exports pass through the Panama Canal.

Fidel Castro is moving guerilla fighters and weapons of war into Panama from La Colma, Cuba, which is Soviet occupied. Panama borders on chaotic Costa Rica and Colombia. Red guerillas have infiltrated El Salvador, and there are red instigated eruptions in Guatemala and Honduras. Except for Nicaragua, the U.S. ten mile wide Canal Zone is the only area of stability in that entire region.

So the real question is not the surrender of U.S. control of the Canal, the real question tonight remains—U.S. control versus Communist control of the Panama Canal. The President and the Congress, and every citizen of the United States, should make this our very top concern.

THE FIGHT FOR PURE FOOD

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in January, I introduced the first version of the Pure Food Act of 1972. Today, joined by 17 of my House colleagues, I am pleased to introduce a perfected version of that bill which would greatly enhance the power of the Food and Drug Administration to regulate the food industry by requiring all food processors to be registered with the FDA and be licensed to do business according to Federal standards. The bill would also call for frequent inspections of food plants and would establish emergency health hazard

powers in the FDA, including recall and embargo authority. The cosponsors of the bill include Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BRASCO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DEL-LUMS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DOW, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. POBELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. ST GERMAIN.

The day before the initial introduction of the Pure Food Act, Charles C. Edwards, Commissioner of the FDA, addressed the opening session of the Annual Convention of the National Canners Association. In his remarks, the text of which appears below, the Commissioner spoke of the importance of restoring the confidence of the American consumer in the food he buys. In particular, Dr. Edwards proposed that the FDA meet its regulatory obligations by:

First. Shifting emphasis from inspection of food processing to inspection of management of food processing—quality control—and permitting processors with acceptable quality control systems to enter the Self-Certification program and quality for minimal FDA attention.

Second. Requiring FDA inspectors and certain processing employees to receive special training as part of this quality control system.

Third. Forming a special committee to review the sterilizing processes used for canned foods.

I agree with the Commissioner that the time is ripe for new Government initiative in the area of food safety. His last two recommendations have great merit and I would support their immediate implementation. In fact, I hope that the FDA would prepare guidelines for all food industries, not just canners, concerning sterilizing processes and equipment essential for the processing and distribution of pure and wholesome food.

Further, I concur with the Commissioner that inspection of quality control systems and records would encourage more meaningful analysis of the nature of food processing in this country. However, as proposed by the Commissioner, this reform promises to be very limited. The FDA has no authority to compel food manufacturers to present quality control information. Under the self-certification program, a company voluntarily agrees to provide FDA inspectors with quality control information in exchange for greater independence in the operation of its plant and minimal FDA supervision. Presently, the program is very small, involving fewer than 20 firms of the more than 60,000 food plants known to the FDA. Commissioner Edwards does not elaborate any new incentives which he believes would encourage more food companies to join this program. Many companies, it appears, see no need to provide the FDA with any more information than the law requires. As the FDA cannot compel quality control information, companies prefer to live under the current minimal FDA attention—with the average plant being federally inspected only once every 6 years.

I interpret the Commissioner's proposal and his reliance on voluntary

arrangements as an expression of the inherent weakness in the FDA's regulatory scheme. The FDA lacks the manpower and legal authority to regulate the food industry effectively. In the absence of power, the FDA has decided to bargain for cooperation with food companies. But unless the Congress first strengthens the food laws, there can be no meaningful reform of Federal food regulation.

Further, by bargaining without real power, the FDA runs the risk of becoming the tool of the industry it is designed to regulate and perpetuates the sham of adequate Federal control. The Congress and the Nation must not countenance this deception.

The decisive ingredient which is missing from the FDA's armory is strong regulatory authority such as provided in my proposal, the Pure Food Act. While I would encourage the FDA to take whatever steps it can under its present authority to improve its food safety operations, including fostering responsible actions by members of the industry, meaningful reform will not be achieved until the legal muscle of the FDA is strengthened.

With that in mind, I have today written my colleague from Florida, PAUL G. ROGERS, asking him as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Public Health, to investigate the nature of the food industry and Federal regulation with a view toward reforming Federal laws. I believe that the Congress must not be deterred from carefully reviewing the situation in the food industry so as to assure the production and distribution of pure and wholesome food.

The following is the text of FDA Commissioner Edwards' remarks:

THE NEED FOR MORE REGULATIONS (By Charles C. Edwards, M.D.)

I am certain that we could all agree that 1971 has seen a number of unprecedented experiences in your industry, and these experiences have created major problems both for you and for the Federal Government. However, I am hopeful that we have all learned from these experiences, and that they will be uppermost in your minds as you chart your course for the coming years.

If the past is in fact the prologue, then it seems clear that 1972 will bring even greater consumer demands for food products. At the same time, I believe that never before have we—both government and industry—had the ability, the awareness, the concern and the willingness to respond as we have today. If I am correct, then I believe there is reason for very real optimism.

In my judgment a first priority must be the restitution of consumer confidence, not through talk, but through actions that deserve his confidence. Direct action is needed to treat those problems which have shaken consumer confidence in the foods he buys; and not one of us here today can afford the false comfort of believing that his confidence has not been sorely shaken. Neither can the buck be passed to consumer "spokesmen" with the excuse that they are primarily responsible for the vast increase in public uncertainty; for I believe we all know that these spokesmen would not be particularly effective without some very real problems on which to build their case.

The fact is that consumers know more today—and they demand more—this applies not only to good quality food, but to protection from poor quality, and the consumer

is increasingly organized to make his demands heard.

Add to this, a constantly increasing ability of industry to provide new and more complex forms of foods and food packaging; add then to this a rapid growth in technology to measure quality or lack of quality—new methods to identify and measure the chemistry and total content of formulated foods—add all these factors together and one conclusion is unavoidable:

The days and years ahead are going to be more demanding on your industry than ever before. And it is the FDA's responsibility to the American consumer to see to it that these expectations are in fact achieved. This we intend to do.

Having said this—and believing it without question—I think it follows that the greatest benefit for all concerned—for the public, for the food industry, for the government regulation—can only come through enlightened leadership on all sides.

And enlightened leadership—to me at least—means maximum and mutual effort.

Adequate regulation cannot be made in a vacuum. Government regulation for example can never compete with industry's capacity to gather facts and to conceive and prove new methodologies so vital to realistic and reasonable regulation.

I think the leadership of your Association is very much aware of the realities, and in my judgment it has demonstrated commendable leadership in recent proposals to upgrade quality controls for all of the food processing industry. I am hopeful that this attitude and willingness to cooperate prevails throughout your membership.

As you know, the policy proposal by your association has been published for comment in the *Federal Register*. We in FDA are studying the proposal and will review the comments we have received to ensure that all steps essential to public safety are included.

The NCA proposals and FDA's plans to evaluate and to expand those proposals are, in principle, an important and specific elaboration of a proposed general reorientation of FDA field operations. This effort involves a shift of emphasis from the inspection of food processing to the inspection of the management of food processing, or more specifically, quality control. If we inspect the processing, we determine only if the operators are in compliance with the law on the day of inspection. On the other hand, if we inspect for quality control, we obtain information about what is likely to be happening on the days when our inspector is not present.

Obviously, it is impossible to inspect for quality control without also inspecting the operation, but it is quite possible to inspect the operation without inspecting for quality control. We are proposing to do both. If the processor has a good quality control system, he can be encouraged to go into the Self-Certification Program and qualify for minimal FDA attention.

On the other hand, if deficiencies in a processor's control are identified, they can be called to his attention and preventive action taken. And I am certain we all appreciate the value of preventive action.

As a part of this quality control system, both the FDA inspectors and certain of your own employees will be required to receive special training. We propose to establish special schools in several areas of the country, accredited, and in some cases sponsored by the FDA, to certify every retort room supervisor and can seam inspector in the industry; every person in these positions will be required to complete these brief courses within one year after the schools are opened. This will be a continuing program of certification. It will be patterned somewhat after the certification program in California, the only State to have such an extensive plan.

At the same time that these schools will

be opening, we will also establish courses for our own food inspectors, in an effort to better prepare them for their role in the quality control program.

It is clear that the spring of 1972 will be a time of considerable importance in the relationship of the FDA and the food canning industry. Aside from the establishment of these instructional programs, the spring should also see a committee formed of FDA officials, industry representatives, and members of the academic community to review the sterilization processes used for canned foods. Your cooperation toward this program has been commendable and your continued help is essential.

These then cover the new steps we in FDA are taking in the area of quality of operational procedures affecting food safety. (Commissioner Edwards remarks on nutritional labeling omitted.)

Following is text of letter to Chairman ROGERS:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 2, 1972.

Hon. PAUL G. ROGERS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Health,
Interstate and Commerce Committee,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROGERS: In January, 1972, Dr. Charles C. Edwards, Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, spoke to the opening session of the National Canners Association's Annual Convention and heralded a reorientation of the FDA's food inspection program. Among other things, the Commissioner indicated that the FDA would shift emphasis from plant inspection to inspection of the management of food processing (or quality control) and place greater reliance on the FDA's Self-Certification Program. This program is a voluntary arrangement which enables food processors to qualify for minimal FDA attention if they provide it with certain quality control information and meet minimum processing standards. To date, this voluntary program has been poorly received by the food industry, with fewer than 20 firms of the more than 60,000 known food plants participating. These companies, it appears, see no need to provide the FDA with any more information than the law requires. As the FDA cannot compel quality control information, companies prefer to live under the current minimal FDA attention—with the average plant being Federally inspected only once every six years.

As I interpret Mr. Edwards' proposal and reliance on voluntary arrangements, it is an expression of the inherent weakness in the FDA's regulatory scheme. The FDA lacks the manpower and legal authority to regulate the food industry effectively. In the absence of power, it has decided to bargain for cooperation with food companies. But unless the Congress first strengthens the food laws, there can be no meaningful reform of the Federal food regulation. Further, by bargaining without real power, the FDA runs the risk of becoming the tool of the industry it is designed to regulate and perpetuate the sham of adequate Federal control over the food industry. The Congress must not countenance this deception.

In the aftermath of recent incidents involving the sale of tainted foods, consumer confidence has been seriously undermined. Recognizing that consumer faith must be restored and that the legal authority of the FDA is seriously deficient and in need of a major overhaul, I introduced the Pure Food Act of 1972, H.R. 12478. Today, I have introduced a perfected version of that bill co-sponsored by 17 of our House colleagues.

I believe it is incumbent on the Congress to develop and pass a proposal, like the Pure Food Act, which would remedy the flaws of the Federal law and assure that the Ameri-

can public buys only pure and wholesome food.

Mr. Chairman, I know of the great interest your subcommittee has taken in the health problems of the American consumer over the past years. In particular, your leadership has been instrumental in the achieving many of the recent reforms which have improved the health laws of this nation. It is now most important that you concentrate your efforts on the issue of effective food regulation. I urge you, Mr. Chairman, to undertake a full investigation of the nature of the food industry and Federal regulation and move forward in the necessary strengthening of the Federal food laws.

With warmest regards,
Sincerely,

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM.

The following is a section-by-section analysis of the Pure Food Act of 1972:

TITLE

Sec. 2. Findings and Purpose.

Sec. 3 (a) Amends Section 44 of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act as follows:

Registration and licensing of food producing plants

Sec. 404. (a) and (b) requires any person engaged in the manufacture, processing or packing of any class of food distributed in interstate commerce to register with the Secretary of HEW his name, place of business, location of every plant and any other information required by the Secretary, and notify him when business permanently ceases.

(c) Requires that every registrant be licensed in order to do business in interstate commerce and prohibits doing business unless licensed. Initially, all registrants will receive a temporary license for one year. Thereafter licenses must be renewed every two years.

(d) Outlines the general conditions of the license.

(e) Sets forth three specific conditions for granting a license or its renewal, including the applicant's (1) providing the Secretary with a complete list of all food handled by his establishment, (2) informing the Secretary of the processes used in the preparation of food and the controls to ensure the production of wholesome and safe food and (3) permitting an inspection according to other provisions of this act.

(f) Requires a license (1) to process any food in containers as required by the Secretary, (2) to retain processing records on all foods for five years, (3) to set aside any food which has been improperly prepared and evaluate it as to any potential public health hazard and report to the Secretary any findings at least seven days prior to distribution, (4) to report to the Secretary all instances of production which may pose a potential public health hazard where the food is already in the stream of commerce, (5) to open all records to inspection and to permit the taking of photographs in connection with such inspection, (6) to include as standard equipment sterilizers, temperature and time control devices and any other equipment the Secretary deems necessary, and (7) to meet any employee educational requirements set by the Secretary, (8) to establish a scheme of insurance itself against losses due to improper production techniques, as required by the Secretary, (8) to follow any regulation promulgated by the Secretary.

(g) Permits the Secretary to revoke a license for cause after notice and a hearing.

(h) Requires the Secretary to coordinate his activities in carrying out this Act with the appropriate state agencies.

(i) Permits the Secretary to charge fees for registering and licensing.

(b) Effective Date:

Sec. 4 and Sec. 5. Amend Sections 703 and

704 of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act by expanding the inspection authority of federal food inspectors to cover such things as performance records and quality controls.

Sec. 6. Amends the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act by creating a new section.

Emergency health hazard authority

Sec. 708. (a) Requires the Secretary upon notification or reasonable belief that there is food in interstate commerce which is misbranded or adulterated to (1) undertake an investigation within 48 hours to determine if a potential public health hazard exists, (2) in the Secretary's discretion, embargo any food suspected of contamination pending the outcome of the investigation and (3) upon determination of a significant potential public health hazard, make public the results.

(b) Permits the Secretary when a significant potential public health hazard exists (1) to order the recall of any or all of the shipment which creates the hazard, (2) to embargo any food produced by such licensee including food not yet within the stream of interstate commerce, or (3) to suspend the license of the person responsible.

Sec. 7. Creates new civil penalties of up to \$10,000 for each violation of the Federal Food Drug and Cosmetic Act and stiffens existing criminal penalties.

Sec. 8 and Sec. 9. Conform other parts of the Act to this new legislation.

STRIP MINING IN OHIO—THE LATEST OUTRAGE

(Mr. SEIBERLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, strip mining for coal is a growing industry in southeastern Ohio. It is a quick way of extracting the coal. As far as the strip mining companies are concerned, it is cheap. Profits are handsome.

But that is where the benefits stop.

All of the tragic side effects of strip mining are dramatically visible in southeastern Ohio, where 280,000 acres have already been ravaged by the big shovels. The land, once green and productive has become a semi-desert, devoid of vegetation and wildlife. Lakes, streams, and underground water-course are poisoned. Whole towns have disappeared from the face of the earth. Many public roads have been closed. The population is falling off drastically. Many of the people who remain live in fear and danger.

The scope of this tragedy is almost too much for the mind to absorb. And the frightening part is that strip mining is increasing at a rapid rate all over the country. I commend to my colleagues a study entitled "Stripping the Land for Coal—Only the Beginning," prepared by the Coalition Against Strip Mining and Friends of the Earth, to get an idea of the impact strip mining will have in the years to come.

The obvious question is why a process so devastating to the State has not been banned, or at least regulated to prevent damage to the land and to the people.

The answer is simple: the power of the coal companies.

In 1948, Ohio passed its first strip min-

ing law. Like those to follow, it was weak and ineffective.

The real battle came in 1965 when, encouraged by passage of a strong law in neighboring Pennsylvania, conservationists geared up to push for passage of a similar law in Ohio. They failed.

The bill was emasculated in committee, and according to one of the committee members, many of the weakening amendments were drafted by the Ohio Reclamation Association, the coal industry's lobby.

As one State Senator said later:

It was a case of "little people" fighting a big economic block.

Operating under the 1965 law, thousands of acres have since been stripped, and thousands of acres have been left unreclaimed. Yet, according to the executive director of the Ohio Reclamation Association, the 1965 law "is a dog-gone good law, working out beautifully."

This year, the whole issue is once again before the Ohio State Legislature. Backed by Gov. John Gilligan, the Ohio House of Representatives last October passed a moderate but meaningful strip mining bill, similar in many ways to the Pennsylvania law.

That bill is now before a Ohio Senate committee, with key votes expected this week.

It began to look as if Ohio would finally get a workable tool with which to deal with strip mining. Then, last Sunday.

Ralph Hatch, president of Hanna Coal Co., a subsidiary of Consolidation Coal, and one of the largest coal strippers in Ohio, called his 1,000 employees and their families together, and threatened that Hanna Coal Co. would be forced to close down its operations in Ohio the day the bill became law.

He urged his employees to contact their Senators and Representatives:

Tell them you will be watching how they vote and remember it at the next election. With your job at stake, you will remember how they vote as long as you live.

It is interesting to note that Hanna Coal Co.'s parent company, Consolidation Coal, continues to operate successfully in Pennsylvania under what is an even more stringent law than that proposed in Ohio.

It is also interesting to note that no such threat was made by Hanna in any testimony before the State legislature. It was timed to affect the vote in the Senate.

Governor Gilligan responded to Mr. Hatch's threat, calling on Members of the Senate to:

Reject the brazen and brutal attempts of the president of a giant coal company to blackmail this government by threatening the livelihood of hundreds of miners and their families.

I would like to have the Governor's full statement reprinted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

This is, Mr. Speaker, just one more example of the need for stringent Federal regulation.

In the continuing absence of strong Federal control, this kind of game will continue, with coal companies playing

off one State against another, using the threat of lost jobs to win their way.

Governor Gilligan's statement follows:

I would add that I further hope that the members of the Senate will resist and reject the brazen and brutal attempts of the president of a giant coal company to blackmail this government by threatening the livelihood of hundreds of miners and their families. His complaints about the bill are dishonest. His threats against the orderly processes of government and against the people of this state are an outrage, that I for one do not propose to tolerate or condone.

To say that legislation which passed the house unanimously is a threat to the coal industry of eastern Ohio is a direct affront to every single member of the House of Representatives who studied that bill, discussed, debated and passed it. And at this late hour for him to surface for arguments like that and with threats to his own employees is reprehensible in the extreme.

ADDRESS BY HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS, MINORITY WHIP, TO AMERICAN LEGION 12TH ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL BANQUET

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday night, March 1, our beloved colleague, LESLIE C. ARENDS, was honored by the American Legion with its Distinguished Public Service Award. I commend the American Legion for having made the best possible selection of a recipient of this coveted honor. I was present at the banquet at which the Legion made its award presentation, and I heard the speech which LES ARENDS made last night. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the House should be made aware of the sage comments on national security made at the Legion dinner by Mr. ARENDS, the ranking Republican member of the House Armed Services Committee. Accordingly, I insert Mr. ARENDS' address in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS BY HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

I cannot possibly convey to you how proud I am to have been selected by such an outstanding organization as The American Legion for this coveted distinguished public service award.

When I consider the national stature and prestige of The American Legion, and the contribution you have made for the preservation and promotion of our American ideals of liberty and justice—

And, when I consider the nature and extent of the services rendered by those previously honored with this award—I am made humble in my pride. I would I could be as worthy.

To have my name inscribed in this manner on the public service "honor roll" of The American Legion is much more meaningful to me personally than you realize. What makes it so meaningful is that I would not have become a Member of Congress, much less been standing here this evening, had it not been for the vigorous, tireless support I received from Legionnaires and the Ladies of the Auxiliaries when I first ran for Congress.

As a World War I veteran I had been active in Legion affairs and was privileged to serve as the District Commander in my area. In the 1934 Congressional election it was suggested that I become a candidate for the Republican nomination for the seat in Congress then held by a Democrat.

I had never been a candidate for public office. I was young and inexperienced and

had meagre financial resources. My home was in one of the smallest towns in the smallest county in the District. Relatively few, except for my Legion comrades, thought I had much of a chance.

But we took that chance! And, thanks to the tireless efforts of the Legionnaires and thanks to the persistent efforts of their Ladies, I won the Republican and nomination by the slim margin of less than 500 votes and went on to win a seat in Congress.

The honor you bestow upon me this evening thus has special significance to me. It was my friends in The American Legion of the 17th District of Illinois who launched me on my Congressional career. Receiving this award means to me that I have not betrayed the confidence they first placed in me as a fellow Legionnaire many years ago.

I must say that I have had no regrets to have made service in the Congress my life work. It has for me been a rewarding experience, and by that I do not mean financially. While the demands are great, I can think of nothing more stimulating and more satisfying than being a spokesman for the people you represent and having a voice, however small, in your country's destiny.

But service in the Congress is not without its frustrations and disappointments, and I suspect I have had more than most Members. You will know what I mean—and I hope sympathetically—when I remind you that during my nineteen consecutive terms since 1935 only two of them have been in Republican controlled Congresses.

Needless to say, over the years I have been well acquainted with the legislative programs of The American Legion as they evolved, year by year, to meet changing conditions and circumstances, and presented to the respective Congresses. No one could be more aware of the long continual fight you have waged, and continue to wage, for the welfare of our deserving veterans and their dependents.

Nor can anyone be more appreciative than I of all that you have accomplished.

The accomplishments of The American Legion go beyond making certain that we, as a Nation of free people, discharge our obligation to those who sacrificed in defense of our freedom. Through various programs, particularly at the local community level, you have done much for a better understanding and a deeper appreciation of what it means to be an American.

To be an American is not a right, either by birth or by acquisition. It is a privilege. It is more than that. It is a life-long obligation to an ideal, with duties and responsibilities. To wear the uniform of the United States is an honor.

This is the doctrine which The American Legion has enunciated since its inception 53 years ago. And this will be the doctrine upon which I will evaluate any proposal of amnesty for those who evaded military service. When our distinguished American Legion Commander testified this morning on amnesty legislation before the Kennedy Subcommittee on the Senate Judiciary Committee he expressed my views, and I am sure yours, when he said that this is not the time to be considering amnesty for draft evaders when our American boys are held as prisoners-of-war and when our boys are still fighting in Vietnam and there is no peace.

And to those who persist in pointing out what is wrong with America, ignoring all that is right with America, I would say: of course, America is not perfect. Perfection means completed, and we have only begun. We will always be striving for a better tomorrow for all Americans.

What of this better tomorrow for which we are striving. It would not be worth the living—however well-fed, well-clothed, well-housed, and well-educated we all may be—if we are not safe and secure in our free-

dom. As President Nixon stated in his recent "State of the Union" address: "There could be no more misguided priorities than one which would tempt others by weakening America, and thereby endanger the peace of the world."

It is written in the Good Book, "What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul." We might ask our liberal friends who complain so vigorously about defense expenditures when there are so many social needs, "What would the American people have profited if every social need is met, and we lose our own freedom."

We recognize there are many social needs to be met and there are budgetary limitations on what the Federal Government can do to meet these needs. We are realistic enough to recognize that expenditures for social programs have much more popular appeal than expenditures for national defense.

And, I might add, we also understand the realities of politics, particularly in an election year.

This may explain, but it does not justify, the attacks some of our social planners—in and out of Congress—have been making on our defense budget. It would be no exaggeration to say that some of them would have us disarm unilaterally to make more funds available for social purposes. I have yet to hear any of them advocate an increase in taxes to meet what they consider to be neglected needs.

All of us recognize there are these social needs. I have supported programs to meet those needs.

All that I ask—and all that The American Legion has ever advocated—is that a sufficient portion of our national resources—a sufficient portion, no more and no less—be committed to our national defense to assure our freedom.

Let us take a look for a moment at this defense budget that they consider so excessive.

The fact is, for the first time in 20 years defense spending has been brought below the level of human resource spending.

The fact is, the new budget for next fiscal year allocates, for the first time, more money to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare than to the Department of Defense.

The fact is, our defense spending in the current fiscal year has fallen to 7 percent of our gross national product and will be down to 6.4 in fiscal year 1973, compared to 9.5 percent in 1968.

The fact is, there has already been a re-ordering of the priorities, and there should be no higher priority than our country's safety and security.

Those are the facts, and yet the social planners complain. They try to create the impression that we are under the insidious influence of a military-industrial complex, whatever that is. The mere fact that 60 percent of our defense budget represents personnel costs belies any influence by a mythical military-industrial complex for unnecessary weapons procurement.

In considering the size of our defense budget it should be borne in mind that we have entered upon a costly program for phasing out the draft and the establishment of an all-volunteer force. A recruit, for example, with less than one year of service received \$78 a month in July of 1963. As of January of this year his pay became \$288 a month, and this does not include numerous fringe benefits.

Our program for the establishment of an all-volunteer force is expensive. But it is what the American people want, and the American people must be prepared to pay the price.

It may be that in raising the level of pay of recruits and young servicemen to comparability with private employment we will still not get an all-volunteer force. Even if

we do not, to pay comparable salaries to our servicemen is, in my judgment, the only fair and equitable thing to do. It is something we should have done a long time ago. If we are going to be in a position of requiring some men to be subject to a draft, we do not want to be also in a position of forcing them to accept unjustly low pay because of that draft.

It should also be borne in mind that inflation has had a tremendous impact on the size of the defense budget in terms of dollars.

Like everything else, a gun, a ship, an airplane, a tank and all other weapons, cost more than three or four years ago. In terms of constant dollars—that is, making allowance for inflation—our defense budget is 30 percent less than for fiscal year 1968, which was a wartime peak and 8 percent less than the 1964 prewar level.

There is no denying that a defense budget of \$83.5 billion is a tremendous sum. But I am confident the vast majority of the American taxpayers are willing to bear this burden as long as it is necessary for our country's security, and provided we get a dollar's worth of defense for each dollar expended.

In a "State of the World Report" President Nixon said: "It is essential that the United States maintain a military force sufficient to protect our interests and meet our commitments."

The measure of sufficiency is not the number of dollars we spend annually on our defense establishment. The measure is whether it is sufficient to ensure the continued safety and security of our country and to maintain peace. Our objective is not to make war, but to deter war.

In keeping with this objective, the size and nature of our national defense is necessarily dictated by the nature of the world in which we live, by the threat and potential threats we face.

The size and nature of our national defense is also dictated by our treaty commitments and by what our allies contribute to our mutual security.

I am constrained to add parenthetically that in my opinion our allies have been contributing all too little and we have been over-committed.

It is on these premises—not what the military might like to have, be it Army, Navy or Air Force; nor what industry might want, be it aerospace or shipbuilding; nor what any of the Presidential aspirants may advocate, be he hawk or dove—it is on a basis of actual need that our Committee on Armed Services make its evaluation of our defense posture and a determination of what should be authorized.

Our Committee is currently engaged in making such an inquiry into our defense needs. And in this connection I should like for you to know that I have always been proud of the non-partisan manner in which our Committee has dealt with all matters pertaining to our national defense.

This has been, and continues to be, our Committee policy, whoever is President and whatever the political complexion of the Congress.

It is hardly necessary to tell you that Soviet Russia continues to be the principal threat to our national security and to the maintenance of peace. But I do not believe the American people are fully aware how grave that threat has become. In the field of nuclear arms Soviet Russia has caught up with us. Their development and deployment of strategic nuclear weapons has been faster than we anticipated.

In testifying before our Committee a couple of weeks ago, Secretary of Defense Laird said something to which I am sure we would all subscribe:

"The American people may perhaps be willing to accept parity in regard to the deployment of strategic nuclear weapons; but,

in my view, they will never accept a position of inferiority."

As we all have known, Soviet Russia is far ahead of us in total number of submarines and has been engaged for several years in a large ship-construction program. We however, have placed great reliance on our lead in a ballistic-missile type submarine, such as the Polaris. Last year we estimated that the Soviet ballistic-missile submarine force will probably not equal ours until 1974. We now find that they will equal our ballistic-missile submarine force next year and by the end of the year could have a force larger than ours.

We are building no new ballistic-missile submarines.

We cannot permit Soviet Russia to gain control of the seas and to have such nuclear strategic superiority as to be able to blackmail us. It is imperative that we maintain a strategic sufficiency as a deterrent to this growing threat. And above all, it is imperative that we maintain a technological superiority.

Many of the weapons systems Soviet Russia is now producing are the product of its stepped up research and development efforts. As Defense Secretary Laird stated before our Committee, "The USSR has now reached a position where—unless we take appropriate action—there could be new surprises and new 'sputniks'."

You will recall how shocked we were and how panicky we became when Russia launched its "Sputnik" in 1957.

It is because of this threat that the President has recommended an increase in defense spending, with the emphasis on research and development that we can maintain technological superiority. We are determined to have now, and in the future, a national defense of such size and nature that no one dare risk an attack on us. To be safe and secure in our freedom and maintain peace is our sole objective. Our military strength is our guardian.

But we all recognize that a peace based solely on the off-setting military might of great powers is an uncertain one, and a costly one. We seek a peace founded on better understandings, mutual respect and mutual trust and an end to the cold war.

That was the purpose of our President's historic trip to China where, after more than 20 years of isolation and hostility, he has brought about better understandings between two peoples of different ideologies. He has paved the way for future accords.

We pray that his forthcoming trip to Russia will be as successful a journey for peace.

For my part I am proud of our President. Mark you that I say our President, for he is the President of all of us, he has given new direction to our foreign policy. He is bringing an honorable end to the war in Vietnam that the sacrifices made there will not have been entirely in vain. He has emphasized in 1969 that while we will honor our treaty commitments, we cannot and will not undertake all the defense of the free nations of the world. We do not intend to police the world.

These past three years have been years of transition: from an era of containment and confrontation to an era of conciliation and negotiation.

Our defense plans depend upon our foreign policy. One implements and supplements the other. Both relate to our national security. The President is also Commander-in-Chief of all our armed forces.

With this separation of powers, as between the President and the Congress, it logically follows that it is imperative there be maximum cooperation between the two, whoever is the President and whatever the political complexion of the Congress. It is my view that politics should stop at the water's edge. And it is my view that at no time should partisan considerations enter into our decisions with respect to foreign policy or with respect to our national defense.

If we are to achieve a generation of peace for which we aspire, it is essential that we give our President the maximum cooperation and support. And it is essential that we make certain that we have a national defense second to none. As President Nixon said in his "State of the Union" Address, "Strong military defenses are not the enemy of peace. They are the guardians of peace."

Let the world know that while the American people love peace, want peace and will work tirelessly for peace, we love freedom even more. I commend you. The American Legion, for your own tireless efforts in behalf of the peace we love and the freedom we cherish even more. In receiving this award at your hands I am both proud and humble. I pledge my best efforts to prove myself worthy.

ONE YEAR AFTER BOMBING

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago March 1 the people of this Nation were shocked when a bomb exploded in this building. The damage that resulted is with us today. True, much of the physical damage has been repaired; but damage remains. Because of the bombing, the traditional free access by the public to this historic building has been circumscribed. And the hundreds of people who work in the Capitol remain concerned, if not fearful, that another tragic incident might mar the symbol of our Nation, and cause personal injury as well.

The anniversary of this tragic event is a reminder that much remains to be done if we are to insure the safety of the Capitol and the legislative branch of the Government is to be secure. Although stopgap measures have been taken—tighter security at the entrances, and discussion of electronic surveillance—what is required is a systems analysis approach to Capitol security.

On October 26 of last year, I introduced H.R. 11476, which is a bill to establish the Office of Congressional Security. We need more than a mere expansion of the Capitol Police Force, more than intermittent sweeps of the buildings in search of electronic surveillance devices, and more than additional security measures at points of entry. In brief, a comprehensive rather than a patchwork approach is what is demanded.

Three principal elements of the congressional establishment—its facilities, personnel and information—are subject to risks and threats against which there are presently no protections or safeguards. And it is imperative that the people we serve have access to their Capitol facilities and to their representatives. To insure this, a single focal point for all security functions is mandatory.

I urge my colleagues to join in support of my bill and insure quick passage. We cannot wait indefinitely to insure the security of our Capitol and the people who use it.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legisla-

tive program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. STRATTON, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BAKER), to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HARVEY, on March 15, 1972, for 1 hour.

Mr. SAYLOR, today, for 10 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM), and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON, today, for 30 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. REUSS, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. FRASER, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROY, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADDABO, today, for 20 minutes.

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. STOKES, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. BOLAND, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. MINISH, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN, today, for 10 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BAKER), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LENT in 10 instances.

Mr. CRANE in five instances.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia.

Mr. WYDLER in two instances.

Mr. HOSMER in three instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. PRICE of Texas in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. THONE.

Mr. WHALEN.

Mr. ARENDS.

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

Mr. MAZZOLI in two instances.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. BADILLO in five instances.

Mr. DE LA GARZA in 10 instances.

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts.

Mr. MITCHELL in two instances.

Mr. ASPIN.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in five instances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN in three instances.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in six instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. BOGGS.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in four instances.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. MONAGAN.

Mr. CURLIN.

Mr. BRASCO.
Mr. WALDIE in two instances.
Mr. PEPPER in five instances.
Mr. WOLFF in three instances.
Mr. BINGHAM.
Mr. O'NEILL.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of hearings on the "Environmental Protection Act of 1971"; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Document Numbered 56, entitled "State Utility Commissions—Summary and Tabulation of Information Submitted by the Commissions"; to the Committee on House Administration.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 748. An act to authorize payment and appropriation of the second and third installments of the United States contributions to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank;

S. 749. An act to authorize United States contributions to the Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank; and

S. 2010. An act to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 1, 1972, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1824. An act for the relief of Clinton M. Hoose;

H.R. 2828. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rose Scanio;

H.R. 2846. An act for the relief of Roy E. Carroll;

H.R. 4497. An act for the relief of Lloyd B. Earle;

H.R. 4779. An act for the relief of Nina Daniel;

H.R. 6291. An act to provide for the disposition of funds arising from judgments in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 178 and 179, in favor of the Confederate Tribes XX of the Colville Reservation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6998. An act for the relief of Salman M. Hilmy; and

H.R. 7871. An act for the relief of Robert J. Beas.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 6, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1681. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the military manpower requirements report for fiscal year 1973, pursuant to Public Law 92-129; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1682. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the reports of the military departments and applicable defense agencies on design, construction, supervision and overhead fees charged with military construction projects completed in fiscal year 1971, pursuant to section 604 of Public Law 91-511; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1683. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 98th quarterly report on export control, covering the fourth quarter of 1971, pursuant to the Export Administration Act of 1969; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1684. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting copies of the determination of the President No. 72-11 waiving the restriction on assistance to Greece, pursuant to section 620(v) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1685. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer franchise fees received from certain concession operations at Glen Canyon Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1686. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the 37th annual report of the Commission, covering fiscal year 1971; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1687. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the position of clerk-clerk within the judicial branch of the Government of the United States, and for other purpose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1688. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for a within-grade salary increase plan for secretaries to circuit and district judges of the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1689. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according to certain beneficiaries third and sixth preference classification, pursuant to section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1690. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1691. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1692. A letter from the Acting Administrator of General Services, transmitting prospectuses for the proposed construction and alteration of various facilities, pursuant to section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

1693. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on the proposed use of research and development funds appropriated to NASA for the construction and equipping of a lunar laser ranging station in Hawaii, pursuant to section 1(d) of the NASA Authorization Act, 1972; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

1694. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report that the effectiveness of the Smithsonian Institution's Science Information Exchange is hampered by the lack of complete and current research information; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 10834. A bill authorizing the State of Alaska to operate a ferry vessel of foreign registry between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between ports in Alaska and ports in the State of Washington, for a limited period of time; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-897). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DULSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report on adequacy and management of services furnished to scholars and researchers by Presidential libraries; (Rept. No. 92-898). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 1746, with amendment (Rept. 92-899). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPIN:

H.R. 13529. A bill to allow a credit against Federal income tax or payment from the U.S. Treasury for State and local real property taxes or an equivalent portion of rent paid on their residences by individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mr. HAYS, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. VANTK):

H.R. 13530. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to furnish assistance for the resettlement of Soviet Jewish refugees in Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself and Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BRASCO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DOW, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. ST GERMAIN):

H.R. 13531. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for

the registration and licensing of food manufacturers and processors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 13532. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 20-percent across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder; to increase the amount of earnings counted for benefit and tax purposes, and to make appropriate adjustments in social security tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CABELL (for himself, Mr. ABERNETHY, and Mr. GUDE):

H.R. 13533. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 to provide for the reimbursement of public utilities in the District of Columbia for certain costs resulting from urban renewal; to provide for reimbursement of public utilities in the District of Columbia for certain costs resulting from Federal-aid system programs; and to amend section 5 of the act approved June 11, 1878 (providing a permanent government of the District of Columbia), and for other purposes; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself and Mr. O'HARA):

H.R. 13534. A bill to amend the Judicial Code with respect to orders of Federal courts intended to desegregate public schools as required by the U.S. Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 13535. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to furnish assistance for the resettlement of Soviet Jewish refugees in Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. PELLY, and Mr. KEITH):

H.R. 13536. A bill to authorize a Coast Guard appropriation for alteration of bridges over the navigable waters; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 13537. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, with respect to its application to small employers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. GROVER, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. GRAY, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. CLARK, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. ZION, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. DORN, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. KEE, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. HOWARD):

H.R. 13538. A bill to authorize appropriations for certain highway safety projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. THONE, Mr. CAFFERY, Mr. BAKER, Mr. ROE, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, and Mrs. ABZUG):

H.R. 13539. A bill to authorize appropriations for certain highway safety projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 13540. A bill to provide for the establishment of projects for the dental health of children, to increase the number of dental auxiliaries, to increase the availability of dental care through efficient use of dental personnel, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 13541. A bill to require that an additional \$4 per month (reflecting post-1970 across-the-board increases in social security

and railroad retirement benefits) be passed along to public assistance recipients, either by disregarding such amount in determining their need or otherwise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEMP (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HUNT, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. SEBELIUS):

H.R. 13542. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to permit the appointment by the President of certain additional persons to the service academies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 13543. A bill to provide financial assistance for the construction and operation of senior citizens' community centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 13544. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize grants and loans to private nonprofit organizations to assist them in providing transportation service meeting the special needs of elderly and handicapped persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CORDOVA, Mr. DENT, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FISH, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GAYDOS, and Mr. HALPERN):

H.R. 13545. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide emergency grants for operating subsidies to urban mass transportation systems on the basis of passengers serviced; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STRATTON, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 13546. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide emergency grants for operating subsidies to urban mass transportation systems on the basis of passengers serviced; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. McDADDE, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NIX, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, Mr. ROBINO, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. SEIBERLING):

H.R. 13547. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide emergency grants for operating subsidies to urban mass transportation systems on the basis of passengers serviced; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 13548. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to eliminate certain requirements respecting contributions of State and local governments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BELL, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr.

CLAY, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SEIBERLING, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 13549. A bill to provide for family visitation furloughs for Federal prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LLOYD:

H.R. 13550. A bill to establish the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area in the States of Utah and Arizona and the Canyon Country National Conservation Area in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 13551. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PREYER of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. UDALL):

H.R. 13552. A bill to provide for affording equal educational opportunities for students in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 13553. A bill to require that an additional \$4 per month (reflecting post-1970 across-the-board increases in social security and railroad retirement benefits) be passed along to public assistance recipients, either by disregarding such amount in determining their need or otherwise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 13554. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to exempt any nonmanufacturing business, or any business having 25 or less employees, in States having laws regulating safety in such businesses, from the Federal standards created under such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 13555. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Mississippi Sioux Indians in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 142, and 359-363, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 13556. A bill to provide for the distribution to the Sisseton and Wahpeton Tribes of Sioux Indians of their portion of the funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Mississippi Sioux Indians in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 142 and 359, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN (for himself and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 13557. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, to allow State agencies to have discretion with respect to the establishment of procedures for coupon allotment deduction and distribution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD:

H.R. 13558. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 13559. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, relating to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of the United States, its territories, and possessions, to include privately owned property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 13560. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the First U.S. International Transportation Exposi-

tion; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 13561. A bill to provide that lending institutions must pay interest on escrow tax and insurance accounts which they maintain with respect to loans secured by residential real property; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THONE:

H.R. 13562. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide that where violations are corrected within the prescribed abatement period no penalty shall be assessed; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 13563. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to compensate permittees where permits for recreational-type dwellings on national forest lands are terminated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WAGGONER:

H.R. 13564. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to reimburse States for the Federal share of the costs of future construction of toll roads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 13565. A bill to amend the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 13566. A bill to provide price support for milk at not less than 90 percent of the parity price thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 13567. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax simplification, reform and relief for small businessmen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUILEN:

H.J. Res. 1089. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim April 24 through 29, 1972, as "National Auctioneers Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. Con. Res. 551. Concurrent resolution expressing the concern of the Congress with respect to the present situation in Northern Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ABOUREZK (for himself, Mr.

BERGLAND, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. ROY, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. ROUSH, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, Mr. ROE, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. SISK, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. OBEY, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H. Res. 858. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the full amount appropriated for fiscal year 1972 for the Farmers Home Administration's farm operating loan program and waste facility grant program authorized by the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, be released and made available by the Administration to carry out the objectives of these programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BERGLAND (for himself, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. HORTON, Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. SCHWENGLER, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. LINK, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. MCKAY, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. BYRON, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, and Mr. HALPERN):

H. Res. 859. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the full amount appropriated for fiscal year 1972 for the Farmers Home Administration's farm operating loan program and waste facility grant program authorized by the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, be released and made available by the Administration to carry out the objectives

of these programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BERGLAND (for himself, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. RONCALIO, and Mr. Dow):

H. Res. 860. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the full amount appropriated for fiscal year 1972 for the Farmers Home Administration's farm operating loan program and waste facility grant program authorized by the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, be released and made available by the Administration to carry out the objectives of these programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H. Res. 861. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the United States should recognize Bangladesh; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Res. 862. Resolution authorizing the Committee on House Administration to incur expenses in making certain improvements in the House Restaurant and related facilities in the Longworth House Office Building; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Illinois):

H. Res. 863. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should suspend, in accordance with section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, economic and military assistance and certain sales to Thailand for its failure to take adequate steps to control the illegal traffic of opium through its borders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

197. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the mayor and Council of the Borough of Norwood, N.J., relative to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WHAT IF THE FARMER WENT ON STRIKE?

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I am dwelling continually on the low prices our producers receive for their food products. I may sound like a broken record.

But this is a very important matter in our rural district. Our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District editors echo my concern in this area.

A good example of this concern is an editorial written by Dave Gallagher in the Montevideo American of February 24.

Mr. Speaker, I insert this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I urge my colleagues to give it their close attention.

What would happen if our American farmers went on strike?

The article follows:

A RAISE FOR WHOM?

Example: A farmer north of Montevideo did some serious figuring after he had harvested his last crop. He listed, on one side

of his paper, the cost of seed, fertilizer, weed killer; the cost of operating his tractor and combine. He did not include a cent for labor.

On the other side of his paper, he noted the price his crop brought at the market. Somehow, the two figures didn't jibe: the farmer was operating at a loss. Taking the same amount of acreage he'd put to seed, he calculated what he could have made had he planted nothing and put those acres aside as diverted.

No matter how he did his arithmetic, the answer was the same. Had he planted nothing at all, he would have made over \$50 per acre more by diverting his land. So, why did he plant anything at all? Because he is a farmer, because he is an inherent gambler, because he has faith in the system.

And, before you draw any wrong conclusions, the farmer is not getting rich on his diverted acreage. That program is not what is haywire. The price the farmer is receiving for his crop is where the problem lies, and there is no foreseeable improvement in the situation.

It has been announced that the consumer can expect food prices to rise four to six percent in the next year. Now who is going to receive that four to six percent? Has anyone heard of the farmers going on strike? Are they pushing for high wages? Better working conditions? More vacations? Better fringe benefits? A guaranteed contract?

Not at all. At present, depending upon which figures one uses, the farmer is receiv-

ing approximately thirty-five cents of every food dollar. Now consider the expenses. Few farmers, individually, can deal on a volume basis, and few can hold onto their crop until the market rises. There are too many subsistence farmers to make that effective.

The farmer must sell his product after the harvest. The processors and distributors do deal in volume and they are taking the lion's share of the profits. When food prices continue to climb, the consumer cannot point an accusing finger at the farmer and wonder how his food dollar is being spent. The finger must be pointed at those who are demanding exorbitant salaries, shorter hours and more fringe benefits for handling what the farmer stakes his economic life on growing.

The finger must be pointed at those who do nothing to halt the flow of foreign foodstuffs into our nation, making our own farmers compete with farmers from other nations; competition they cannot come away from in a healthy financial state.

This writer cannot help but wonder what could happen if the American farmer went on strike. The coal workers in England are striking now. The nation is literally without power. Businesses must close early. Lights are turned off early at night for lack of electricity. Commuter trains no longer run. And in spite of the inconvenience, Englanders are, for the most part, supporting the coal miners.

Would Americans, if there were no food to be purchased, support the American farmer